

A 904,588

The Psychology of
· Bolshevism ·

JOHN SPAAGO

**THE PSYCHOLOGY OF
BOLSHEVISM**

BOOKS BY JOHN SPARGO

**THE PSYCHOLOGY OF
BOLSHEVISM**

BOLSHEVISM

**SOCIAL DEMOCRACY
EXPLAINED**

**AMERICANISM AND
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY**

**HARPER & BROTHERS, Publishers
NEW YORK AND LONDON**

The Psychology of Bolshevism

By

JOHN SPARGO

Author of

"BOLSHEVISM," "SOCIAL DEMOCRACY EXPLAINED,"
"AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY,"
ETC.



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF BOLSHEVISM

Copyright, 1919, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America
Published December, 1919

H—T

PREFACE

In this little volume I have attempted to explain the psychology of that great movement of impassioned discontent and violent revolution which, because of its rapid development in Russia, and because of the impetus it has received from its terrible pre-eminence in that unfortunate country, we call Bolshevism.

Revolutionary Communism is a menace to civilization. It is an ironic fact, providing food for deep and serious thought, that the end of the great world war has brought mankind not peace, but only a more difficult and serious conflict. The Peace Treaty signed at Versailles remarkable as documentary historical evidence of the complete failure of the most ambitious and arrogant militarist scheme in history—does not really mark the return of peace to a war-weary world, but a new alignment of mankind for a war even more terrible. Every organized nation, with its culture, its laws, its arts, and its institutions—its civilization, in a word—is menaced by a new form of despotism and terrorism.

In country after country we find large masses of people ready to revolt against the

P R E F A C E

existing social order, and to establish by the relentless and unscrupulous use of brute force a despotism more formidable than anything ever attempted by Hapsburg, Hohenzollern, or Romanov. Like these and all their predecessors, the creators of the new tyranny make fair promises of ultimate freedom, well-being, and happiness. But in their experiment upon the living body of human society they would destroy the institutions and the usages which alone can make possible the orderly development of humanity toward a self-chosen ideal.

If we are to overcome this new peril, if civilization is to be preserved, we must understand not only the program but the spirit and the mental processes which have developed the program. What are the experiences which have led so many of the toilers to see no hope except in this terrible experiment? What are the sources of their grim despair and of their irrational hopes? And what makes men and women of education and sincere democratic idealism, men and women who might well be expected to appreciate the great danger to all that is best in civilization, accept the Bolshevik program as a panacea for the ills of mankind, contrary to all the lessons of human experience?

P R E F A C E

To these and kindred questions I have tried to give the answer in uncompromising candor and plain and forthright language. I have no pet theories to promulgate, nor any interest other than to assist in making Bolshevism understood in order that it may be intelligently combatted. It cannot be charged against me that I am satisfied with existing social arrangements, or that I lack sympathy with the desire to bring about radical, and even revolutionary, changes in society. During many years I have devoted such gifts as I possess to the work of convincing my fellow citizens of the need for a thorough reorganization of our economic life.

My studies of the social problem long ago convinced me that the socialization of the economic life must depend ultimately upon the socialization of human thought and character. Anti-social conduct, whether on the part of individuals or masses, can never advance genuine Socialism. No social state can be stronger than its human foundations. Only men and women whose lives are governed by social consciousness can build and maintain a truly socialized society. Bolshevism is wrong because it is anti-social, because its ideals and its methods are as selfish and tyrannical as those of unrestrained capitalism,

P R E F A C E

or even those of Czarism itself. It emulates the worst and most oppressive policies of past oppression to bring about future freedom.

In analyzing the various types of men and women who become imbued with the spirit of Bolshevism I have had the advantage of an extensive acquaintance with a very large number of men and women, belonging to widely differing social groups, who are either intense Bolsheviks or belong to the large class of near-Bolsheviks. I could easily have followed the "case" method and given detailed descriptions of many individuals to illustrate each group or category. That method, however, while admirable in many respects, particularly for the use of specialists, would have had the great disadvantage of limiting the appeal of the book to a relatively small circle of readers. By setting forth my views in the present form I hope to assist a larger number of readers to a better understanding of the Bolshevik menace.

My thanks are due to the editors of the *World's Work*, the *New York Evening Post*, and the *Christian Century*, of Chicago, for their courteous permission to use material previously published in their pages.

JOHN SPARGO.

"NESTLEDOWN," OLD BENNINGTON, VERMONT.

**THE PSYCHOLOGY OF
BOLSHEVISM**

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF BOLSHEVISM

I.

GREAT mass movements, whether these be religious or political, are, at first, always difficult to understand. Invariably they challenge existing moral and intellectual values, the revaluation of which is, for the normal mind, an exceedingly difficult and painful task. Moreover, the definition of their aims and policies into exact and comprehensible programs is generally slowly achieved. At their inception, and during the early stages of their development, there must needs be many crude and tentative statements and many rhetorical exaggerations. It is safe to assert as a rule that at no stage of its history can a great movement of the masses be fully understood and fairly interpreted by a

THE PSYCHOLOGY

study of its formal statements and authentic expositions only. These must be supplemented by careful study of the psychology of the men and women whose ideals and yearnings these statements and expositions aim to represent. It is not enough to know and comprehend the creed: it is essential that we also know and comprehend the spiritual factors, the discontent, the hopes, the fears, the inarticulate visionings of the human units in the movement. This is of greater importance in the initial stages than later, when the articulation of the soul of the movement has become more certain and clear.

It is not at all difficult to understand the main features of the Bolshevik creed, as these have been formulated in many languages by leaders of the movement in many lands. The outlines of the creed are fairly firm and clear, though there are, naturally, many gaps and many crudities. Many problems have been evaded, many have not even been recognized, while many more have been only tentatively and fearfully approached. Nevertheless, the outlines are impressively clear. They are quite easy to understand, because there is so little in them that is not so familiar as to be commonplace. Neither in principle nor in

OF BOLSHEVISM

policy does Bolshevism present anything of material consequence that is original, or that cannot be found amply and explicitly stated in the voluminous literature of Socialism, Anarchism, and Syndicalism which antedated the emergence of the Bolsheviks from Russia's chaos with their sinister challenge to civilization. Lenin, the foremost theorist of the Bolsheviks, the only one thus far to command serious intellectual attention, is by no means a great original thinker. On the contrary, it would be extremely difficult to name any writer who ever attained anything like such intellectual eminence and prestige whose writings were so absolutely unoriginal. His theoretical ideas, together with his statement of them, he takes from Marx. Marxian generalizations, in Marxian phraseology, constitute the whole of his philosophical equipment. Even in the domain of political practice he is altogether bereft of originality and inventiveness, his practical program and tactical policy being slavishly copied.

If this critical estimate detracts somewhat from the glamor which has lately surrounded this strange figure, and from the homage which even his bitterest critics have paid to the first statesman of Syndicalist-Communism,

THE PSYCHOLOGY

it at the same time adds impressiveness to his position, and to him as a symbol of a great challenging power. It is precisely because he has announced no new ideas or ideals, but has confined himself to familiar principles, stated in the most orthodox Socialist language, that he has so easily won so great a following. New and radically novel ideas spread very slowly: the human mind is innately conservative and slow to abandon old ideas and ideals for new ones. This is especially true when the old ideas form the credo of a sect, school, cult, or party. The more passionate and ardent the loyalty in any of these, the more intensified the emotional factors, the more determined is the resistance to new ideas and the more fanatical the sense of orthodoxy. The early and enthusiastic stages of every religion have been the most dogmatic and intolerant. These are the reasons why radicals and radical movements are proverbially intolerant, sticklers for orthodoxy, given to heresy-hunting, and slow to accept changes.

Had Lenin renounced the old Marxian theories and shibboleths and sought to substitute for them new and unfamiliar theories and shibboleths, he would not have found fol-

OF BOLSHEVISM

lowers in large numbers for a long time. They would have come slowly, one by one, and, even so, it would have required a genius he has given no indication of possessing, to stir the interest and arrest the serious attention of mankind. His strength, and therefore, his menace, rests altogether upon his utter lack of originality, his orthodoxy. His appeal involved no keen intellectual or spiritual struggle on the part of those to whom it was addressed. To savagely desperate men who were in a mood to destroy he preached active destruction. He did not call upon them to abandon any cherished article of faith, to open any closed chambers in their minds, to receive any new doctrines. He did not say to them: "What Marx and his immediate disciples taught us long ago no longer holds good; we must abandon it and revise our creed in accordance with new conditions, new knowledge, and new needs." Had he done that, however brilliantly, he would have had to contend against the immense resistance to change common to every "ism" and nowhere stronger than in the Socialist movement. Choosing the line of least resistance, he rested his appeal for destruction upon the orthodox faith of his Socialist comrades, appealing to

THE PSYCHOLOGY

them in this sense: "Marx long ago showed the way we must go. Nothing can change the truth. Those who urge us to change are all false prophets. Loyalty to the old faith alone can bring victory."

Unless we bear in mind the fact that its intellectual appeal professes to rest upon the authoritative traditions of the Socialist movement, that Lenin depends for intellectual authority upon the intellectual authority of Marx, we shall never be able to understand the rapid and world-wide spread of the creed of Bolshevism. Yet, paradoxically, Bolshevism and Marxian Socialism have little in common, and between the teachings of Marx and those of Lenin there is little likeness. What Lenin presents in the name of Marx is a caricature of Marx's real thought. The name and the words of Marx are often upon his lips, but the essential spirit of Marx is absent.

Here, too, we have a phenomenon that is familiar enough in the psychology of popular movements. In practice orthodoxy rarely conforms to the pattern. The formulations carefully made by great theologians become the nominal theology of a sect or church, but the actual working theology is nearly al-

OF BOLSHEVISM

ways quite different. It is conceived upon a lower intellectual plane. The master-minds are reflected by the lesser minds, but much is changed in the process. Phrases and formulae are retained and tiresomely repeated, but their original values are modified or altogether lost. The everyday theology thus becomes a caricature of the nominal theology. In the same way, Lenine and his followers have evolved a caricature of the Marxian teachings they profess to follow.

This is illustrated by the cardinal feature of Bolshevik policy—the attempt to establish that form of class rule called the “Dictatorship of the Proletariat.” Seventy-two years ago, November, 1847, in formulating a “theoretical and working program” for the Socialist movement of the time, Marx predicted that in the course of the evolution to a higher state of society, the existing struggle between the capitalist class and the working class, the latter, which he called the proletariat, would become the masters of society. Triumphant, this class would set up, he predicted, a dictatorship—the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Because of this prediction by Marx, Lenine and his followers claim that they are the true and orthodox exemplars of

THE PSYCHOLOGY

Marx's teachings when they try to set up, in the conditions existing to-day, something that they call a proletarian dictatorship. Lenine makes no claim to originality.

II.

Since we are not concerned here to vindicate Marx, it is not necessary to discuss the manner in which the facts of historical development belied the forecast. Like many another nineteenth century forecaster, Marx fared badly enough in the twentieth century. Our concern is not with nineteenth century forecasts, but with twentieth century realities. It is only because Lenine and his co-conspirators have been and are supported by many Socialists who, confounded by phrases, believe that the wretched bureaucratic dictatorships set up by Lenine and his followers are what Marx had in mind, that it is worth while to point out how far this is from the truth.

Marx was strongly influenced by Barnave and other intellectuals of the French Revolution, and used the term "proletariat" in the sense in which it was used by them. So used, it connotes something more than poverty,

OF BOLSHEVISM

namely, a contemptible position in society, little better than serfdom, including lack of the rights of citizenship. In Roman society the term was applied to a large class, held in contempt, including peasants, wage-laborers and all others without capital, property, or assured means of support, regarded as contributing only *proles—offspring*—to the wealth of the State and unfit and unworthy to exercise political rights.¹ The proletarian estate was not poverty merely, but poverty plus political disfranchisement. *The greater part of our working-class, except the unnaturalized alien workers, is not proletarian at all in the strict Marxian sense.*

When Marx wrote his famous *Communist Manifesto* the growing wage-working class was almost universally proletarian in this sense. Neither in England nor in any country of continental Europe did the wage-earners as a class enjoy the franchise and direct parliamentary representation. It was not until many years later that the working-classes obtained the right of suffrage and their spokesmen appeared in the parliaments. In

¹One learned modern philologist suggests that the word "proletarian" is derived from *pro-oletariorius*—manure-worker, hence a person of low and degraded estate.

THE PSYCHOLOGY

1847, that degree of emancipation did not appear within the limits of practical politics. At that time and for long afterward Marx had no vision of the great amelioration of the condition of the working-class to be brought about through electoral reform, social legislation, successful trades-unionism, and other agencies. He believed that a development the exact opposite of that which took place was inevitable. His theory of an eventual proletarian dictatorship rested upon, and was inseparable from, his belief that the mass of mankind was doomed to proletarianization; that the inexorable laws of capitalist development condemned the overwhelming majority of civilized mankind to ever increasing misery, and, finally, to proletarian degradation.

It was a grim tragedy that he sketched: An ever diminishing class of exploiters growing richer and richer; an ever growing class of exploited growing poorer and poorer. No humane instinct or sense on the part of the rulers to lessen the brutality of the process, nor any state craft free to check it. Finally, when the overwhelming majority of people reached the uttermost limit of endurable misery, then, and then only, would occur the

OF BOLSHEVISM

inevitable cataclysm, the irresistible revolt of the many against the few. In that great hour of retribution, Marx believed, the victorious proletariat, the overwhelming majority of mankind, would establish the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," ruling instead of being ruled. Ultimately, Marx believed, as Lenin now does, this class oppression would cease, and in place of classes a fraternal co-operative democracy be realized. But first of all must come the revolution itself and then the proletarian dictatorship, this to be continued long enough to enable the proletariat "to abolish itself as proletariat"—to use the cryptic phrase of Engels—that is to say, to abolish the degrading conditions which make proletarians of the workers, to reconstruct the social order.

Obviously, there is only a nominal relationship between this theory of rule by an immense majority and the wretched despotism of a small minority which Lenin and his colleagues have imposed upon Russia's millions, or the like tyranny of the few over the many which the Spartacists sought to set up in Germany. Whatever we may think of Marx's theory, which he himself abandoned, be it observed, it cannot by any rational process be

THE PSYCHOLOGY

interpreted to cover these grotesque utopias of despotism. These latter are related rather to the pre-Marxian conspiracies to set up the dictatorship of militant minorities, from Robespierre to Blanqui. During the greater part of his life he was in constant conflict with the advocates of such conspiracies.

III.

The philosophy of the Russian Communist leader, whose influence, especially outside of Russia, is so largely derived from his appeal to Marxian orthodoxy, is essentially pre-Marxian and anti-Marxian. It is not so surprising after all that so many of the orthodox followers of Marx have failed to perceive this, and have accepted Lenin at his own valuation. The writings of Marx are difficult reading. Like the Bible, they are far oftener referred to and quoted than read. Only an infinitesimal minority of those who call themselves Marxian Socialists have ever studied Marx at first hand. Few possess the intellectual training necessary for such a study. The great majority know only a few isolated texts. They know Marx only through popular written and oral expositions, many of

OF BOLSHEVISM

which are very crude and very far from accurately representing the thought of Marx. In other words, the actual working theology of the Marxian sect differs radically from its nominal theology, being conceived on a lower intellectual plane. It is significant that, with only one exception, so far as I have been able to discover, every recognized Marxian scholar in the Socialist movement of every country, including Russia, has denounced and combatted Bolshevism. The exception is Nikolai Lenine.

We encounter here a psychological fact of very great importance, namely, that the restraints implicit in Marx's teachings are, unfortunately, inoperative so far as a very numerous body of his professed followers are concerned. Lacking the education and the mental training requisite for a full understanding of the Marxian system, they are at all times mentally ready to condone, and, under favorable conditions, to attempt, that conspiratorial form of agitation and struggle against which the Marxian system is essentially directed. This was the case even while Marx was alive and active in the international Socialist movement. Again and again he found himself engaged in bitter con-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

flict with individuals and factions in the movement who were advocating policies not materially different from those of the Bolshevik conspiracies of these latter days. These conflicts threw into strong relief the complete dependence of the social revolution as Marx conceived it upon a long evolutionary process. Thus, in 1850, in the Communist league, for which the famous *Manifesto* was written, there arose a faction in the Central Committee which wanted "revolutionary action" and an immediate attempt to capture the reins of government by some daring *coup de surprise* and set up proletarian dictatorships. Against these impatient Hotspurs Marx stoutly contended that, far from being ready to institute a new social order, it would take the workers a long time, possibly fifty years, not to change society to their ideal, but to fit themselves for political power. With infinite scorn he denounced the "revolutionary phrase-mongers" and their silly flattery of the proletariat.

It has been observed that in every uprising the leaders of the Bolsheviks have manifested greater bitterness toward the non-Bolshevik Socialists than toward either capitalists or the political upholders of the old régime. This is entirely logical and consistent. No political

OF BOLSHEVISM

philosophy, no theory of society, no system of industrial organization, accepted by the up-holders of capitalist society, is so diametrically and irreconcilably opposed to Bolshevism as modern Socialism when properly understood. The more developed the Socialist movement is, the closer its contact with reality and, consequently, the clearer its perception of its responsibilities, the more bitter the conflict with Bolshevism becomes. Here in the United States, where Socialism is an insignificant political force as yet, where, as the leading organ of the party has said, there are many districts in which elephants are more numerous than Socialists, this conflict is mainly rhetorical and academic. But in Russia and Germany it inevitably assumed the character of civil war.

The reconstruction of society upon a Socialist basis is a very formidable program. Its realization must, under the most favorable conditions imaginable, take a great many years. Indeed, it must take many years to make any appreciable structural changes in the social organization. Society cannot be socialized faster or farther than the human units of which it is composed are socialized. Social forms and institutions change very

THE PSYCHOLOGY

slowly in response to propaganda and idealistic forces. Only under the impact of great economic developments do they change with relative rapidity. Even so, the relative rapidity of such changes is painfully slow when measured in terms of the duration of an individual human life. A short speech by a convincing speaker, an epigram, or a cleverly written leaflet, may completely change the character and direction of a man's thinking and result in his commitment to a program too far-reaching to be completely realized in fifty or even a hundred years. It is not strange, but perfectly natural, that many men and women find the tax upon their patience and their fate too severe and fall victims to political despair or to the blandishments of those who profess to have discovered shorter routes to the goal. Get-rich-quick schemes depend for their success upon the same human weakness of impatience, the desire for twelve o'clock at eleven.

Naturally, where the Socialist propaganda results in a strong organization which succeeds in effecting substantial reforms faith is more easily sustained and there is less despairing doubt, less temptation to heed the allurements of the purveyors of social quack

OF BOLSHEVISM

nostrums, than where the agitation brings no tangible gains. The political sterility of the American Socialist movement, its complete failure to become a positive force for the progressive advancement of the democratic Socialist program, and the unfortunate policy of the American Federation of Labor, to which more than anything else is due the absence of anything like a Labor party in this country, must be counted among the most regrettable circumstances of our present day political life. They are responsible for a very large part of the political despair and bewilderment which is the working capital of Anarchism, Syndicalism, Bolshevism, and their variants.

The obvious domination of our politics and government by the capitalist interests inevitably contributes to the same result. Labor's indictment is not to be dismissed lightly. Legislation for the protection of the workers lags far behind the enlightened consciousness of mankind; legislatures are far more quickly responsive to the demands of capital; the executive forces of government operate with the same discrimination. Something very close to a plutocratic dictatorship has long ex-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

isted and has done much to foster the desire
for a proletarian dictatorship.

IV.

It has been cynically observed that most men learn nothing from history except the fact that they learn nothing from history. The Lenines, Trotzkys, and Bela Kuns can hardly be said to have learned even that little from history. Nothing in the whole range of Bolshevik psychology is more remarkable than the utter obliviousness of the Bolshevik leaders to the plain lessons of history. Take, for example, the insistence of Lenine and Trotzky, approved by their American followers, that the proletariat of to-day must base its tactics upon the example of the ill-fated Paris Commune of 1871; could there be a more glaring illustration of mental inability to profit from even the most tragic experience?

The Commune had nothing to do with the social theories of Communism, of course. It was purely a political movement. Widely divergent groups, holding economic and social theories which were antagonistic and mutually destructive, united in hostility to the existing government, to the Prussian peace,

OF BOLSHEVISM

and in favor of political federalism. The only basis of agreement of a constructive nature was the theory that the State should consist of absolutely autonomous self-governing communes, loosely federated, and subject to no central authority whatever. It was fundamentally a retrogressive and reactionary proposal, which, if successful, would have weakened France immeasurably and made her an easy prey to the new Empire which Bismarck created.

Because the French members of the already tottering *Internationale* were active in the Commune, drawn into the vortex of unrest by the never-dying hope that the extremity of the old order, as they conceived the crisis, would prove the golden opportunity of the new, Marx himself saw it through rose-tinted revolutionary spectacles. For a brief while he lapsed back into the faith of Blanqui, the belief that an energetic, courageous and ably led minority could seize the powers of organized society and set in motion a new social order. But Marx was very soon disillusioned, as Engels has told us. It could not be otherwise: his theory of the economic motivation of history was too firmly based, too dominant in his mind, to be thus easily destroyed. A

THE PSYCHOLOGY

more reckless, ill-advised undertaking, or one more certainly doomed to abortive failure was never attempted.

Even for the limited program of political federalism the methods of the Commune were inadequate to the point of puerility. Children playing with fire symbolize wisdom in comparison with the desperate men who thought thus to seize the political machinery of a great modern State and immediately direct it to new ends. So much Marx and Engels recognized before the tragic struggle was over. But nearly half a century later we find men like Lenine and Trotzky ignorantly repeating the tragic errors of 1871, upon a far vaster scale; trying to apply the methods of the Commune to the immeasurable task of realizing the vast program of communism in a land in which the historical and economic development for that program is wholly lacking. It would be a spectacle to excite the laughter of gods and men were the issues less tragic, but there can be no laughter, no mocking derision, only infinite sadness, when we remember that their ghastly experiment amounts to a vivisection of the writhing and bleeding body of Russia.

How, then, shall we account for the ready-

OF BOLSHEVISM

ness of men and women who have thought long and earnestly upon the social question, who call themselves liberals and democrats, to applaud a policy so inherently and so demonstrably illiberal and undemocratic, so completely discredited? It is easy enough to understand how the illiterate, ignorant, and superstitious, goaded by misery, follow these mad counsels, but what of the men and women of education, the Intellectuals, who defend them instead of exposing them for what they are?

V.

No single formula affords an adequate answer to these questions. No one category covers all these misguided muddlers. There are various distinct and separate approaches to the same evil result. We can, however, define some of the categories with reasonable and useful clearness. Some are so embittered by hatred of the capitalist system and its manifold injustices that they are incapable of making rational and moral distinctions in all matters relating to the struggle against that system. Often they are highly intelligent men and women of the highest rectitude in their

THE PSYCHOLOGY

personal lives, inspired by the purest motives, but rendered so abnormal by hatred of the system and its results as to be incapable of making those mental and moral distinctions which are essential to sound and efficient citizenship. It is characteristic of this type that passionate and sincere denunciation of even petty injustice, when this emanates from the ruling class, is commonly associated with a most callous indifference to, or even passionate indulgence in or defense of, the grossest acts of injustice emanating from the subject class, even when the victims of these acts of injustice are not members of the ruling class, but fellow members of the class to which the perpetrators of the unjust acts belong. What seems to be evidence of moral inconsistency and insincerity is in fact evidence of a pathological condition, a fairly well defined form of psychoneurosis.

Another large category is composed of typical victims of another quite well defined form of hysterical hyperesthesia. Their thought processes are spasmodic and violently emotional. They are obsessed by some fixed idea, which is emotionally and not rationally derived. This type of mind has been the subject of much extensive observation and study,

OF BOLSHEVISM

particularly in connection with religious forms of hysteria. No one who has attended many Bolshevik meetings, or is acquainted with many of the individuals to whom Bolshevism makes a strong appeal, will seriously question the statement that an impressively large number of those who profess to be Bolsheviks present a striking likeness to extreme religious zealots, not only in the manner of manifesting their enthusiasm but also in their methods of exposition and argument. Just as in religious hysteria a single text becomes a whole creed, to the exclusion of every other text, and instead of being itself subject to rational tests is made the sole test of the rationality of everything else, so, in the case of the average Bolshevik of this type, a single phrase received into the mind in a spasm of emotion, never tested by the usual criteria of reason, becomes not only the very essence of truth, but also the standard by which the truth or untruth of everything else must be determined. Most of the preachers who become pro-Bolsheviks are of this type.

People who possess minds thus affected are generally capable of, and frequently indulge in, the strictest logical deduction and analysis. Sometimes they acquire the reputa-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

tion of being exceptionally brilliant thinkers because of this power. But the fact is that their initial ideas, upon which everything is pivoted, are derived emotionally and are not the results of a deliberate weighing of available evidence. The initial movement is one of feeling, of emotional impulse. The conviction thereby created is so strong and so dominant that it cannot be affected by any purely rational functional factors. As long as it remains, that is to say until the spasm passes or some fresh and more powerful emotional impulse pushes it aside, it grips the mind and enslaves its faculties. People of this type, who, as the popular saying goes, "think with their feelings," are far more numerous than is generally supposed. They fall very easy victims to religious hysteria, and to all forms of propaganda and agitation in which the main characteristics of hysteria are present.

It is characteristic of this type—and the characteristic is admirably illustrated by Bolshevik literature—that it coincidently decries intellectualism and parades its own intellectuality. Sneering at intellectual demonstration it displays at the same time a childish pride in its own manifestations of intellectual

OF BOLSHEVISM

power and resources. People of this type jump at decisions and reach very positive convictions upon the most difficult matters with bewildering ease. They have been rushed to these convictions upon a storm of emotion, and have not endured the protracted and painful labor of moving step by step along a way paved with intellectually satisfying resultants of deliberation and weighed evidence. In consequence of this peculiar experience they see every problem in very simple terms. For them the complexities and intricacies which trouble the normal mind do not exist. Everything is either black or white: there are no perplexing intervening grays. Right is right and wrong is wrong: they do not recognize that there are doubtful twilight zones. Ideas capable of the most elaborate expansion and the most subtle intricacies of interpretation are immaturely grasped and preached with naive assurance. Statements alleged to be facts, no matter what their source, if they seem to support the convictions thus emotionally derived, are received without any examination and used as conclusive proof, notwithstanding that a brief investigation would prove them to be worthless as evidence.

There are other recognized characteristics

THE PSYCHOLOGY

of this type of abnormality, all of which will be found strongly marked in the mentality of the average Bolshevik. Bitter intolerance is one of these. Of course, intolerance is not, *per se*, a sign of hysteria. Sometimes, indeed, intolerance is the outcome of pure rationality. But when an audience of radical protesters against limitations upon the right to free speech and free publication hiss and howl down whoever tries to express an opinion with which they do not agree, their conduct is hysterical, that is, excessively emotional, and not rational: they are not logically consistent to any ideal of freedom. In the moment of demanding freedom they are denying the freedom already existing. More than once I have seen Bolshevik audiences, as well as audiences of Socialists, howl with fury in denunciation of the suppression of free speech by police authorities, and then furiously clamor till they have howled or terrorized into silence some speaker with whose views they did not agree; thus suppressing, most effectually, the expression of opinions they did not favor. Thus they were coincidently doing a thing and denouncing others for doing it. Certainly, wholly rational minds would not be so inconsistent. Of course, emotional infectiousness

OF BOLSHEVISM

and mass suggestion are present in such cases. Crowd psychology is distinct from individual psychology. The fact remains, however, that the individuals comprising the crowd are peculiarly over-emotional.

The group of men and women in this country whose sympathy for the Bolsheviks is well-known have been notably ready to protest against despotic and undemocratic acts, such as the suppression of free speech and assemblage, the brutal treatment of political prisoners, excessive prison sentences, and so on. With what fervor they denounced the restrictions imposed upon popular liberties during the war we know. How strenuously they objected to conscription, and how solicitous they were for the supposed "rights" of the so-called conscientious objectors, will be remembered. Now, zeal for popular freedom is a noble quality and should not be held lightly or derided. By such zeal the heritage of hardly-won freedom is preserved from age to age. It is when we turn from contemplation of their attitude as defenders of freedom to their attitude as defenders of the Bolsheviks that the group we are discussing are seen to be intellectually unbalanced. Ask any of them to condemn the outrageous suppression

THE PSYCHOLOGY

of popular liberties by the Bolshevik government in Russia, the unspeakably brutal treatment of men and women whose only offense is the expression of democratic opinions, or the ruthless murder of innocent men and women, and no word of condemnation will come. They will defend the suppression of the Constituent Assembly, of public meetings, and the press; they will condone and defend the introduction by the Bolsheviks of capital punishment without trial, conscription and every other device of militarism, alleging simply that these things are necessary to enable the Bolsheviks to "save the fruits of the Revolution." Reply to them that here in America we, too, had a Revolution, the fruits of which we sought to save by conscription and by extraordinary restrictions of our normal freedom, and it at once becomes apparent that some mental inhibition makes them incapable of applying to America the rule they so glibly apply to Russia. The simple truth is that reason does not rule in their minds: it is only present as a secondary force, as a dependent of a controlling master emotion.

Equally characteristic of this form of psycho-neurosis is the manner in which the actions of those subject to it are determined by

OF BOLSHEVISM

slogans, catchwords, and formulae. This verbal hypnosis idealizes the commonplace for them, and makes it possible for old and time-worn ideas to excite the enthusiasm and energy peculiarly associated with the exhilaration of intellectual adventure and discovery. Quite frequently ideas and programs which make no appeal under old and familiar names create tremendous enthusiasm when they are labelled with new and unfamiliar names. Many examples of this might be cited, but two or three illustrations must suffice. During the whole period of modern industrialism there was never a time when discontented workers did not attempt to gain revenge for real or fancied wrongs by spoiling materials and tools, retarding production, and so on. Nothing in these practices ever inspired men to construct elaborate theories about them, or to build policies upon them, until the strange Scotch colloquialism "Ca Canny" fascinated a little group of French Intellectuals and to translate it they coined the new word "Sabotage," which in turn fascinated certain groups in this country. Commonplace trades union policies and ideas were thus easily glorified by the mere substitution of French terms for English.

THE PSYCHOLOGY

It is safe to say that the hypnotic influence of such unfamiliar terms as "Bolshevism" and "Soviet Government" has had far more effect in making the central features of the principles and policies connoted by them acceptable than any of the qualities of the principles and policies themselves. If it had been proposed that, instead of our present form of government, we should establish government by our Trades and Labor Councils, very few of our Intellectuals would have found anything in the proposal to enlist their sympathy and support. Yet that is precisely what soviet government means. As far back as 1869, at the Congress of the old *Internationale*, the replacing of political governments by federated councils of labor unions was actively promulgated and became the basis of a propaganda. This old idea was revived by the I. W. W., in 1905, but fell flat and went unheeded by our Intellectuals until the introduction of the French word "Syndicalism" gave it something of a vogue for a brief while. Lenine has admitted that he and his colleagues simply adopted the I. W. W. program in its entirety, but lo, because a Russian name has been attached to it, it is hailed as something new under the sun.

OF BOLSHEVISM

Finally, the hysterical type we are discussing is easily moved to ecstasy and sees in minor and relatively restricted measures almost unbounded potentialities. In an earlier day the Chartists of England contended for reforms which were just and altogether admirable. In all save minor and unimportant details, their program was realized. It is highly amusing and equally instructive today to read the ecstatic forecasts of some of the hysterical leaders of that great struggle as to the results to be expected from the realization of their aims. Much the same thing may be said of the numerous agitations and propagandas which have succeeded--Co-operation, equal suffrage, compulsory education, prohibition. Every such movement has seemed to many a sure and safe short-cut to Utopia. Yet the promised land is still far, far distant.

If we take the group of American Intellectuals who at present are ardent champions of Bolshevism we shall find that, with exceptions so few as to be almost negligible, they have embraced nearly every "ism" as it arose, seeing in each one the magic solvent of humanity's ills. Those of an older generation thus regarded bimetallism, for instance. What else could be required to make the desert

THE PSYCHOLOGY

bloom like a garden and to usher in the Earthly Paradise? The younger ones, in their turn, took up Anarchist-Communism, Marxian Socialism, Industrial Unionism, Syndicalism, Birth Control, Feminism, and many other movements and propagandas, each of which in its turn induced ecstatic visions of a new heaven and a new earth. The same individuals have grown lyrical in praise of every bizarre and eccentric art fad. In the banal and grotesque travesties of art produced by Cubists, Futurists, et al, they saw transcendent genius. They are forever seeking new gods and burying old ones.

The typical Bolshevik Intellectual of the type we are discussing here, as distinguished from the proletarian type (whose economic experience and environment are so different and, in war periods, so naturally conducive to the Bolshevik state of mind) is marked by the following hysterical characteristics: exaggerated egoism, extreme intolerance, intellectual vanity, hypercriticism, self-indulgence; craving for mental and emotional excitement, excessive dogmatism, hyperbolic language, impulsive judgment, emotional instability, intense hero-worship, propensity for intrigues and conspiracies, rapid alternation of extremes

OF BOLSHEVISM

of exaltation and depression, violent contradictions in tenaciously held opinions and beliefs, periodic, swift, and unsystematic changes of mental attitude. Not every individual invariably exhibits all of these characteristics, of course, nor are these the only characteristics, generally symptomatic of hysteria, to be observed in this type.

It would be going too far to say that these individuals are all hysterical in the pathological sense, but it is strictly accurate to say that the class exhibits marked hysterical characteristics and that it closely resembles the large class of over-emotionalized religious enthusiasts which furnish so many true hystericals. It is probable that accidents of environment account for the fact that their emotionalism takes sociological rather than religious forms. If the sociological impetus were absent most of them would be religiously motivated to a state not less abnormal.

In the clique applauding Bolshevism, and favoring its introduction into the United States, we find also the usual number of adventurers common to revolutionary movements and uprisings. Many of these are simply gamblers. They rush into every agitation, always hoping that "something will turn up."

THE PSYCHOLOGY

Native uprisings in India or Africa, Sinn Fein rebellions in Ireland, guerilla warfare in Mexico, race riots in Chicago or Buda Pest, or strikes in London or San Francisco are all equally alluring. Every disturbance, no matter what the cause may be, is welcome because it may provide the occasion for the fateful something to turn up.

VI.

A very different category from any of the foregoing is composed of a small class of wealthy persons who more or less lavishly give from their wealth to subsidize the Bolshevik propaganda. Testifying before a committee of the Senate of the United States, one of the best known of the American pro-Bolshevist Intellectuals is reported to have said that the Bolsheviki can always readily obtain funds for their propaganda from rich, idle women who have nothing else to do. The cold cynicism of this remark deserves to be classed with Lenine's famous statement, at the Third Soviet Conference, "Among one hundred so-called Bolsheviki there is one real Bolshevik, with thirty-nine criminals and sixty fools."

The association of men and women of great

OF BOLSHEVISM

wealth with such a propaganda is remarkable as a phenomenon, but not exceptionally unusual. A few years ago it was observed that a number of rich society women devoted such sympathetic attention to the I. W. W. that it almost became a society fad. The I. W. W. leaders were quite at home in the drawing-room of Fifth Avenue, and were familiar figures at house parties on the fashionable Massachusetts North Shore. Rich women are far oftener interested in such propaganda than the men of their families and their circles, perhaps due less to sexual differences than to the fact that the men are more intimately and directly connected with, or engaged in, the great industrial and financial organizations which are the center of attack. It is well known, however, that women are far more subject to hysteria than men whatever the explanation (concerning which there has been so much learned controversy) may be.

Notwithstanding the cynical testimony before the Committee of the United States Senate, already quoted, it would be a serious mistake to conclude that Bolshevism is only subsidized by fad-seeking women of the idle rich class. On the contrary, some of the women who give their money to sustain the prop-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

aganda of such movements as Anarchism, Syndicalism, and Bolshevism are serious and high-minded women of splendid intelligence, and character. They are in no sense of the term society butterflies; they are not inferior in character or general intelligence to the women of the same class who support churches, missions, and charities. They are, moreover, quite as careful and as conscientious in spending their money.

In this numerically small class are included several distinct types. With perhaps one exception, hyperesthesia is common to all of them. The exception consists of unemotional individuals, creatures of pure intellect, whose minds work with mechanical precision and regularity. A cynical contempt for minds which are less exact, or which are influenced by sentiment, is common to these super-intellects. Generally, they are crass materialists. Generally, too, their sexual life is either arrested or abnormal. This is especially true of the women. They have been thwarted in love and remained unmarried, their normal desires being starved, or if married they are sterile. Such people come as near attaining "the passionless pursuits of passionless knowledge" as human beings may.

OF BOLSHEVISM

The type is hard, dried-up, brilliant, and capable of great callousness and cruelty. Minds of this cold, mechanically exact type are often remorselessly analytical, and they find constant exercise in the dissection of social institutions, laws, and customs, in exposing the multitudinous imperfections of these and in devising perfectly working substitutes for them. They are natural born Utopia-makers. Spurning sentiment, indifferent to traditions, careless of others' feelings, they take into account every fact but one, namely, life, as Emerson said of Robert Owen and his associates.

To such minds democracy, even at its best, must appear crude, ill-working, and incapable of efficient functioning. Soviet government can be diagrammed and made to appear, on paper, very much better adapted to the needs of a complex industrial society. The same type of mind is allured by artificial and arbitrary schemes and systems of all kinds, such as systems of human stirpiculture, new forms of family life, methods of feeding, currency systems, and so on. From people possessing minds of this type and plenty of cash come most of those curious books propounding new and elaborately devised schemes for

THE PSYCHOLOGY

remaking society which start out by putting aside as of no consequence the whole past history of mankind and all the strongest forces of human nature. There is a god-like detachment in the attitude of these cold-blooded supermen: they seem to say "Come, let us remake mankind and the world according to our own patterns."

A much more numerous group in this class is composed of men and women, the latter being the more numerous, in whom hyperesthesia takes the form of a modified Christian asceticism. They are morbidly sensitive of the privileged position they occupy as a result of the possession of wealth they have not earned, and feel a keen sense of personal responsibility for the existence of the ills which attend the production of the wealth they possess, especially poverty and its ill effects upon the wage-earners and their families. Philanthropy cannot satisfy minds of this order. They are too literally Christian for that. The social implications of the Christian religion lead far beyond philanthropic make-shifts. It requires something quite different than poverty relieved by private bounty, nothing less, in fact, than a complete revolution in society which shall make possible full

OF BOLSHEVISM

equality of opportunity for every human being, which is the Christian ideal.

Recognition of these facts and a profound social consciousness are admirable and praiseworthy. The sincere Christian who consecrates his or her wealth to bring society to the Christian ideal is all too rare in the world to-day and merits praise and reverence. But the problem which this presents to the individual is exceedingly intricate and difficult, as Tolstoy, among others, found. The advice given by Jesus to the rich young man, to sell all he had and give the proceeds to the poor, however well suited to the particular case, is not a solution of the problem as it presents itself to the average rich man or woman. Be the difficulties ever so great, however, the goal will always challenge the earnest effort of souls whose faith is simple and direct and incapable of subtle adaptations.

The borderland which divides healthy religious idealism from morbidity is narrow and easily crossed, as the history of numerous religious ascetics clearly shows. Frequently the difference is the result of sexual discontent. Definition here may be practically impossible, but the distinction is valid and important. That most of the wealthy supporters

THE PSYCHOLOGY

of Bolshevism belonging to the group under consideration have crossed the narrow borderland is evident. As a rule they are ready to believe the worst of the system and also of its beneficiaries, the class to which they belong. On the other hand, they idealize the class below, even its vices. The luxury by which they are surrounded becomes intolerable to them, yet no degree of simplicity or austerity in the manner of living possible to them without disrupting all family and social ties can bring contentment. Consequently, every advantage they possess becomes a source of secret torment. They develop a psychic state differing not in kind, but only in degree, from that of the religious ascetics and mystics who in all ages have sought and found solace in self-abasement, living in caves, wearing hair shirts, and other forms of "mortification of the flesh." They hold education and culture lightly, even despising them as fruits of cursed wealth, and readily accept the leadership of ignorant fanatics and demagogues. Apocalyptic preachers of rapidly approaching equalitarian milleniums readily attain ascendancy over such minds.

Because the inner tension is so great and compelling, minds in this psychic state are

OF BOLSHEVISM

immune to impressions from without. The appeal of rationality, therefore, is quite fruitless when directed against convictions resulting from that inner tension. The most abundant and conclusive evidence which tells against their convictions is rejected. The paltriest excuse suffices to justify this rejection: "It comes from the capitalist press," "He is a capitalist and would naturally say that," "He does not understand"—with such phrases the most important and amply validated testimony is swept aside. On the other hand, the wildest and most improbable statements are believed when they are agreeable and conform to convictions already firmly established. Rumors and fancies become facts, and no amount of exposure will suffice to discredit them.

That persons of this type should support the propaganda of Bolshevism and similar cults in this country is perfectly natural. They are dangerous in proportion to the wealth and the social influence they possess. Yet they are only differentiated by indefinable and almost imperceptible degrees of sensibility and suggestibility from an extremely important and useful social group, men and women of wealth and social influence who, keenly aware

THE PSYCHOLOGY

of the evils which beset modern society, and earnestly and intelligently seeking to serve the common good, devote their wealth and their influence to the furtherance of well-considered social reforms and programs of social reconstruction. Women's trade unionism, movements for equal suffrage, child labor legislation, housing reform, Single Tax, and Socialism are among the many constructive movements which have thus been advanced.

Another fairly definite group included in this class of rich pro-Bolshevists differs from the religious type simply in the source of their exaggerated emotional sensibility. Religion in the formal sense is lacking as a causative factor: their hyperesthesia is of secular origin. In this group, as in the others, women greatly outnumber men, though the disparity of numbers is not so great as in the religious group. A very important factor in the psychology of this group is what for lack of a better term may be called the impatient reaction from experienced disillusionment. Ardent idealists, deeply stirred by the poverty and sufferings of the poor, and by the injustice too often meted out to the workers in the conflict of the classes, they have tried, through Settlement work and other non-revolutionary

OF BOLSHEVISM

agencies, to bring about better conditions. Even where their work, when seen in proper perspective, has been admirably effective and successful, they have experienced a crushing and bitter sense of failure and disappointment. It is ever thus with the reformer: the effect of the outpouring of the whole energy of a single life is so microscopic and imponderable; the fair ideal seems, after a lifetime spent in its quest, as far away as ever. Such disillusionment brings a state of depression and exaggerated sensibility, the most fertile soil for desperate suggestions confirmatory of, or logically developing, their mood. In this state of mind they are easily persuaded that daring and drastic revolutionary practices are imperative. They are easily persuaded, too, that "things cannot be worse." Political methods with their innumerable compromises, delays, intrigues, and deceptions, exasperate such persons and they are readily converted to "direct action."

There remains the intellectually heterogeneous group composed of individuals who belong to none of the foregoing classifications. Some are simple romanticists, always living in a dream-world of their own, ignoring realities and governed in their actions by ab-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

stract ideas and ideals: War is wrong, therefore let us end it by making the fighting men see that they are doing wrong; let us get the men out of the trenches and send them home. We believe in the Brotherhood of Man, therefore let us urge the intermarriage of negroes and whites. It was a rich Northern woman of this type who proposed to go into the Southern States to "wipe out the distinctions which keep the children of a common Father apart." In her recklessness she was ready to make a terrible experiment upon the life of a great nation, to risk the most disastrous consequences. Others in this heterogeneous group are innately rebellious spirits, instinctive anarchists as it were, who can recognize the presence of no authority, law, or binding custom without feeling an overpowering resentment and passion to defy it. Finally, there are the neurasthenics whose mental nerves require the constant excitation of novelty, precisely as others require the excitation of alcoholic exhilaration, and those who similarly crave the stimulus derived from notoriety. These last find their contracts with revolutionary agitations an easy way into the headlines of the daily press.

OF BOLSHEVISM

VII

Considered either as the faith or the fad of rich men and women, or of little coteries of bourgeois Intellectuals, Bolshevism would not be very important. The association of such individuals and groups with this revolutionary propaganda merits attention mainly because of its value as an auxiliary to a really formidable force which has its origin and its location in lower social levels. Apart from this fact it would be of interest to the psychologist only for its illustration of certain minor forms of abnormal psychology. Bolshevism is important as a manifestation of aspiration and energy by a section of the proletariat, as the hope and the effort of a fairly considerable and growing portion of the most numerous class in society, a class potentially powerful enough in this and other highly developed industrial nations to impose its rule, whether for good or ill.

As we have already noted, the term proletariat which Marx used, and which has come into our common everyday usage through Marxian Socialist literature, hardly applies, in the sense in which Marx used it, to the bulk of the working-class in this or al-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

most any other great modern nation. It is a misnomer to apply the term to a citizen class. Little or no good can result, however, from attempting to overcome this error and to impose a new and restricted meaning to a word so popularly misused. Presumably the word "proletariat" will continue to be used as a synonym for "wage-working class."

To account for the spread of Bolshevik ideas and ideals among the members of this class to such an extent that it constitutes one one of the greatest political facts of our time, a knowledge of the historical background is imperatively necessary. It is impossible to understand Bolshevism unless and until we understand the class psychology which produces it, and that requires an intelligent understanding of the great struggle of opposing classes which characterizes modern capitalist society. Bolshevism is a product of that struggle and inseparable from it. The struggle of the classes is not a mere Marxian hypothesis; it is a profound fact of fundamental importance, a major factor among the determinants of social evolution. Whether we accept the class struggle theory of Marx or reject it, and whatever we may think of the philosophy of history of which it is a part,

OF BOLSHEVISM

we must accept the fact of class conflict or fail to reach an intelligent comprehension of Bolshevism. To refuse recognition to so obvious a fact, to deny that there are classes in America, classes with opposing interests, each with a distinct psychology of its own, is to darken counsel and make intelligent citizenship difficult.

Marx pointed to the fact that the great stages in the historical development of mankind were the culmination of struggles between classes with opposing interests and ideals. A dominant class is overthrown by a class hitherto subject but henceforth dominant. Thus feudalism was supplanted when the feudal nobility was overthrown by the newer and more powerful manufacturing or capitalist class. It was not only in their basic economic interests, in the sources of their income, that these two great classes differed. They differed quite as much in their political and social ideals. In precisely the same way, the modern working-class and the capitalist class whose power it challenges have different and antagonistic economic interests and also different and antagonistic political and social ideals. Marx called upon the proletariat to unite against a common foe, to subordinate

THE PSYCHOLOGY

every difference of race, creed, or craft to the end of reaching a common goal. A desperate note rang through his stirring appeal: he was addressing, not workers merely, but proletarians, men who were in fact wage-slaves, recognized only as subjects for economic exploitation, property-less, and without the protective and assertive powers conferred by citizenship. It was to a class which had no share and no stake in the State that he addressed the appeal, "Proletarians, of all countries, Unite! you have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain!" This same appeal is being made today to a working-class which has, indeed, much to lose, because in the meantime it has gained an immense possession. Bolsheviks, Spartacists, Anarchists, Syndicalists, Communists, and Socialists reiterate the old cry, notwithstanding the gains made by trades and labor unions, the immense progress of the co-operatives, the great body of protective and remedial legislation, and the extension of full political rights to the working class now, almost universal. The potency of the old appeal in the new order of the world proves that there is still a great sense of injustice. The language of the appeal may be attacked for its

OF BOLSHEVISM

hyperbolic exaggeration, but millions respond to it because they feel that they are victims of intolerable wrongs and because they feel that there is "a world to gain" by protest and sacrificial struggle.

When we are inclined to content ourselves with the judgment that a class which has gained so much should be gratefully content, there are two facts to be remembered: the first fact is that these gains have been won by the workers themselves by heroic effort and sacrifice. They wrested the franchise from the ruling class; they created the unions and raised the standards of living; their agitation and organization forced the enactment of the protective and remedial legislation. The second fact is that the social ideals of a class advance with improvements in its conditions. In the upward evolution new wants have been realized, wrongs newly discovered, fresh ambitions developed, new and higher standards perceived. To vote, to choose governors, is no longer a satisfying ambition; that sufficed in the middle of the nineteenth century, but today the desire is to participate in actually governing. "Fair wages for a fair day's work" was a far vision then; today's vision is of a system of industrial democracy

THE PSYCHOLOGY

dependent on no such cash nexus, but on collectively and democratically organized labor for the collective good. Bearing these things in mind, why should a struggle which has succeeded so admirably so far be abandoned? And why should we expect the workers to be silent concerning the new things they have learned?

The Marxian shibboleth, so old yet ever new, appears in its extremist form in the preamble to the constitution of the I. W. W. which declares that "The working class and the capitalist class have nothing in common." This is quite obviously untrue. Probably no one really believes it to be true. It is a notable example of the extent to which the minds of man may be influenced by the iteration of a misleading phrase. Every individual in an I. W. W. Convention could probably be made to see and to admit that the sentence above quoted is inaccurate, yet it would almost certainly be impossible to get such a Convention to abandon the statement in favor of one which every individual delegate would accept as accurate and truthful.

That workers and capitalists living in the same city, or the same nation, have a great and ever-increasing number of common in-

OF BOLSHEVISM

terests is obvious. They have common interests in good sanitation, fire protection, the integrity of the courts, the inviolability of the ballot, the security of wives and children against violent assault, the regular transportation of food, and so through an almost interminable list. There is often an important identity of interests between capitalists and wage-earners, even in the industrial field, where conflicting interests are most accentuated. Prolonged unemployment is equally undesirable to both classes. The attempt to enact legislation injurious to or calculated to destroy a particular industry unites employers and employees in opposition to it.

There is an important element of truth in the exaggerated aphorism. There is a conflict of economic interest inherent in the relations of the two classes. Leaving narrow and shortsighted individual policies out of account, and considering only the relations of the two classes exemplified by the most intelligent and progressive policies of both, the following rule is reached: the undiluted economic interest of the capitalist class is to maintain between the sum of values produced by labor and the sum of wages paid to labor

THE PSYCHOLOGY

the greatest difference consistent with the efficiency and contentment of the laborers. On the other hand, the undiluted economic interest of the workers is to receive in wages the largest possible proportion of the sum of values created consistent with the existence and growth of the enterprises concerned. This is the abstract law: of course, other factors, such as humanitarian idealism, love of approbation, tradition, and so on, may enter in and exert a modifying influence. The economic law, however, is as stated.

From this fundamental difference of economic interest there inevitably proceeds an equally great difference in class consciousness and feeling. How otherwise, shall we account for the uniformity with which the employing class has opposed the unionism of the workers, and the marked degree of uniformity with which the two classes have taken opposite sides in almost every movement to bring the State into the regulation of industrial conditions? In the early stages of capitalism the capitalist class held the principle of *laissez faire* to be the ideal basis for industry and for the guidance of the conduct of the State in its relations with industry. The workers, on the other hand, manifested a detestation

OF BOLSHEVISM

of this principle, too uniformly diffused throughout the entire class to be accidental, and held that the State must impose limitations and restrictions upon industry in such matters as hours of employment, the age of availability for employment, working conditions, and the like. Today the capitalist class in general accepts the principle of active interference by the State, but wants this interference kept within bounds. It wants private industrial enterprise in every field with only as much State regulation as may from time to time be found necessary to maintain the physical well-being of the workers and to avert more revolutionary action. On the other hand, in proportion to its increase of control over the forces of the State, the working class seeks to increase the regulative functions of the State in industry, *and even to have the State supplant private industrial enterprise in many important fields.*

VIII

Bolshevism marks the extreme point of working class antagonism to the capitalist ideal. Here as elsewhere extremes meet and there are many resemblances between the most

THE PSYCHOLOGY

anti-social ways of the capitalist class and some of the anti-social ways of the Bolsheviks. But increasing opposition to private capital and industrial enterprise is characteristic of the entire organized labor movement, and not of the Bolshevik minority alone. Year by year the most conservative unions progress toward a collectivist ideal in their demands. This is true of the labor movement of every great industrial nation and is not materially affected by the form of government. It is as true of England as of the United States and of Japan as of either of these great Occidental countries. Labor's instinctive ideal is democratic as opposed to the instinctively autocratic ideal of the capitalist class. But for the modifying factors of State interference and the influence of labor organizations, industry would still be conducted upon the lines of absolute autocracy. Labor during the last fifty years or so has effectually smashed autocracy in industry. It is now bent upon realizing the opposite ideal of industrial democracy. Even Bolshevism, utterly autocratic and hostile to democracy as it is, doubtless aims at some form of industrial democracy as an ultimate ideal. Lenin and all the other recognized

OF BOLSHEVISM

spokesmen of the cult have insisted that the despotism of the minority euphemistically designated the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" is to be transitory; that the ultimate goal is industrial democracy.

Soviet government must not be confounded with Bolshevism. The two things are quite distinct and each must be judged upon its own merits. Not all who believe that the Soviet form of government should replace political government of the forms familiar to us are believers in Bolshevism. Many of the most earnest opponents of Bolshevism are equally earnest supporters of the Soviet type of government. They would achieve the transformation by constitutional methods, in countries where constitutional government exists, and in any case they would base the new system upon democratic suffrage. The fact that Bolshevism first appeared as a political force in association with government by Soviet authority does not warrant us in regarding them as identical, or as being necessarily interdependent, any more than the fact that Bolshevism first appeared in Russia warrants the conclusion that it is essentially and peculiarly Russian.

That in some manner the democratization

THE PSYCHOLOGY

of industry will be accomplished in a not far distant future is a safe prediction. It is probable that the best features of Soviet government will be grafted on to the political State. With the attainment of political democracy industrial autocracy was doomed. The existence of a superior ruling economic caste speedily becomes an intolerable anachronism in a State where political democracy is safely established. The idea that masses of men and women must spend the greater part of their lives working under conditions determined by others, without any effective and established right to control their labor and its fruits is obsolete. It does not belong to the twentieth century. There is much significance in the fact that the only constructive program for maintaining our system of railway transportation, which had reached a condition of near bankruptcy and administrative and functional chaos under capitalist management, comes from the most conservative section of the trades union movement in this country and is based upon the co-partnership of the State and organized labor in this important branch of economic administration. Of course, the defenders of the old order of things, with characteristically futile indignation, invoke

OF BOLSHEVISM

the red specter of Bolshevism to frighten us. They learn nothing from experience; otherwise they would know that they are more effective promoters of Bolshevism than any of the Bolsheviki. The Bourbons of industry are the most powerful propagandists of Bolshevism.

The psychology of the demand for industrial democracy is not difficult to understand: Human beings in civilized States find themselves associated in three great forms of association. First, they are associated in their political relations. Governments are developed and laws enacted for the purpose of regulating these relations. Independent of these political relations, which are largely involuntary, there are numerous voluntary groupings, into churches, clubs, societies, lodges, and the like. Finally, there are the economic relations, which concern them as consumers and producers. In the main, these relations are involuntary and arbitrarily imposed. They are far more important than all other relations combined and far more extensive. The average man makes fewer contacts with the laws and machinery of the State than with the economic factors of his life. More than half the time he is awake is spent

THE PSYCHOLOGY

in labor of some kind and that covers only one side of his economic interest. As a consumer, the whole period of his life, including his leisure and his sleep, is profoundly affected by the operations of economic laws and by the economic status in which he is placed.

Now, experience has taught mankind that democracy is the best principle upon which to base the government of human relations. For these relations which are voluntary in their nature, and which are always amenable to freely chosen direction, democracy is the form of control almost universally chosen. In the modern world men rarely base clubs, lodges, churches or similar voluntary organizations upon anything but democratic self-government. In the political domain men have everywhere consistently moved away from autocratic forms of government towards democratic forms. Nowhere do we find an exception to this rule: however imperfect democracy may be, it brings about a far greater degree of satisfaction than any autocratic, oligarchic, or hierarchical form of government has ever done. That is the pragmatic test. No other is of any value.

With the lessons of experience so uniformly emphatic in favor of democracy, it would be

OF BOLSHEVISM

extremely absurd to suppose that the greatest and most vital sphere of human activity could permanently remain under forms of control which experience in every other sphere of life has led men to abandon. The hours and conditions of labor, the methods and rates of remuneration, the degree of personal freedom during labor, the things to be made and the terms and conditions upon which they may be had—these and a host of matters of vital concern to every normally useful life cannot safely be left to any direction less representative than the collective whole. In whatever form it may be embodied, the principle of democracy must inevitably be applied to the economic life of the world.

IX

The old school of Socialists was characterized by a very simple and direct psychology. It idealized the political state and relied upon it as the logical agency for the socialization of industry. This view is now as antiquated and obsolete as the *laissez faire* individualism against which it was directed. Not only by Syndicalists and Bolsheviks, but by the most moderate and constructive advo-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

cates of social democracy, the political State is now held to be unfitted for the complex technical work of industrial organization and management. Government industrial enterprise as we know it has succeeded on the whole even less well than capitalist industrial enterprise. It has been extravagant and uneconomical; it has developed a formidable bureaucracy; it has been marked by favoritism and other evils attendant upon political influence.

In proportion as government becomes increasingly concerned with economic functions the inefficiency of the present method of government by representation of groups in geographical areas becomes increasingly evident. There is a growing consciousness of the necessity of securing representation of technical knowledge and experience, of functional representation, in short. If governments are to own and operate railroads, mines, and factories, then governments must be composed of men who possess the training and the technical skill necessary to operate railroads, mines, and factories. This technical equipment is necessary in the legislative department of government almost as much as in the administrative. Men who are ignorant of

OF BOLSHEVISM

the practical side of railroading are not competent to make laws governing the organization and administration of railways. The fact that a man lives in a particular geographical area, and is highly popular among his neighbors, is no sort of reason for giving him power to determine by his vote how mines shall be operated, what railroad rates shall be, or what wages shall be paid to machinists. Still less does it justify his elevation to a position of ultimate authority over the real technical directors, with power to impose upon these policies which they know to be impracticable and even disastrous.

When we found ourselves in a state of war, and in need of the highest efficiency in the organization of our economic resources of which we were capable, we did not attempt to rely upon individuals representing groups ranged in geographical areas merely. Instead, we pressed into the service men who represented technical knowledge and functional ability. As a result we gained immensely in efficiency. The men of technical knowledge and skill brought to our government a degree of practical ability never before witnessed. Temporarily, we linked together geographical and functional repre-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

sentation. Normally, however, we go on leaving the making of laws for a complex industrial system in the hands of men who know little or nothing of industry; men whose training often peculiarly unfits them for the task of legislating for an industrial society. We have in the present House of Representatives, for example, two hundred and sixty lawyers, more than a majority of the entire membership. No one is likely to claim that this in any manner represents the economic life of the country, or that these lawyers owe their place in Congress to any special knowledge of our industrial problems. The least useful and important of professions, economically considered, dominates our House of Representatives because so many lawyers are "good mixers" and glib talkers, and because the practice of law and activity in politics can be united in a way that is not possible in the case of any other profession.

It is not difficult to imagine a system of government much more efficient and representative of the life and needs of the nation. Such a system, instead of being based upon the representation of geographically defined units, would be based upon units composed of occupational groups. Those engaged in a

OF BOLSHEVISM

given professional group would be directly represented by some member of that group; those in an industrial group would be similarly represented from within their own group. This would in practice amount to the inclusion in the electorate of every useful member of society, only the parasitically idle being excluded. This assumes, of course, the inclusion of those who are idle only as the result of old age or physical disability. The difficulties in the way of instituting so great a reform would be very great, but it is improbable that they would be as formidable as now appears. It is the universal experience that the difficulties of instituting new reforms are greatly exaggerated. Theoretically, at any rate, such a system as suggested makes possible a much more competent, as well as more representative, type of government. Now, is there any good reason for believing that it would be lacking in the flexibility necessary to give opportunity for the expression of conflicting ideals and theories of government, such as collectivism versus individualism, conservatism versus radicalism, and so on?

The demand for such a change in the form of government as will give direct representa-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

tion to the workers, and the technical professions, upon all legislative and administrative bodies having anything to do in connection with the economic system, is not based upon Bolshevism and has nothing in common with the dogmatic hatred of the State of the old Anarchism. It arises from the widespread recognition of the fact that the political State based upon geographical considerations cannot be an efficient agent for the management of industry on democratic lines. But because Bolshevism appeared as a political force in conjunction with, or as an incident of, Soviet government, and because Anarchism, Syndicalism, and Bolshevism all aim at substituting government by labor and professional councils for the existing form of government, there is great confusion here. On the one hand, the reactionaries, the Bourbons, denounce as Bolshevism every expression of the new view. On the other hand, the Bolsheviks themselves, naturally desirous of appearing to be much stronger than they are, aim to create the impression that belief in government by occupational groups and Bolshevism are synonymous and identical. Doubtless there are many well-meaning persons who regard themselves as Bolsheviks when in fact they

OF BOLSHEVISM

are not, but simply believers in an industrial form of government for an industrial society.

What is now termed Soviet government was clearly foreshadowed in 1869, by the followers of Proudhon, as can be seen from the resolutions discussed by the *Internationale*. It was far more clearly and comprehensively promulgated, however, in 1905, in the City of Minneapolis, in an address by an American Socialist, the late Daniel De Leon, one of the founders of the I. W. W. Lenine himself has placed upon record his appreciation of the manner in which De Leon anticipated the conception of Soviet government, and the justice of this is made manifest by the following paragraph from De Leon's speech:

"As the slough shed by the serpent that immediately appears in its new skin, the political state will have been shed, and society will simultaneously appear in its new administrative garb. The mining, the railroad, the textile industries, down or up the line, each of these, regardless of former political boundaries, will be the constituencies of the new central authority. . . . *Where the General Executive Board of the Industrial Workers of the World will sit there will be the nation's capital.* Like the flimsy card houses that

THE PSYCHOLOGY

children raise, the present political governments of countries, of states, aye, of the City on the Potomac herself, will tumble down, their places taken by the central and subordinate administrative organs of the Nation's industrial forces."¹

The social ideal of the I. W. W. which De Leon thus expounded, is very clear and precise. We perceive the outline of a new social order, an industrial State, in which the union of the workers, closely federated, will manage all industries, regulate wages, working conditions, prices, production, consumption, and all other economic interests. They are also to administer the general affairs of society, making and executing all necessary laws and regulations. There will be no other government than this. What is here described is Soviet government pure and simple, for Soviet government is simply the Russian term for government by councils of labor unions. Equally, the I. W. W. ideal is the ideal of Syndicalism as prescribed by the leaders of the Syndicalist movement in France and Italy.

¹Daniel De Leon, *The Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World*, pp. 38-39.

OF BOLSHEVISM

There is a very striking likeness between our I. W. W. and Bolshevism, distinguishing sharply between the latter and mere belief in Soviet government. The psychological characteristics are identical. There is the same contempt for the rule of the majority; the same dependence upon energetic and daring minorities; the same reliance upon the *coup de force* to set up a proletarian dictatorship. In the American movement as in the Russian there is a glorification of the proletariat. In the one movement as in the other emphasis is laid upon the glaring and obvious antagonisms of interest separating the extremes of society, while the numerous common interests, the social bonds already developed, are ignored as of no consequence. Common to both is a narrow interpretation of the word "labor," which results in the basing of their policies upon the interests and energies of manual workers only. In the jargon of Bolshevism the petty farmer who cultivates his own land and owns his own tools, and perhaps employs a boy or man to assist him, belongs not to the "working-class" but to the "bourgeoisie." In the literature of the I. W. W. the same distinction appears. Mr. Austin Lewis has even insisted that skill is property,

THE PSYCHOLOGY

that the skilled workman does not therefore belong to that proletariat which is destined to rule the world. Finally, in both the Bolshevik movement of Russia and the I. W. W. movement of this country there is a reckless and brutal spirit of hatred which is directed not against capitalism merely, but against individual capitalists. There are differences in minor details, due to the differences in economic development of the two countries, but these are relatively insignificant. A common purpose, a common method and a common psychology unites the two movements.

Nothing is more remarkable than the thoroughness with which we have failed to understand the rise and growth of the I. W. W. in this country. Because some of the leaders of the movement have been obviously influenced by the theoretical and tactical teachings of certain French and Italian Syndicalists, and because of a very clearly defined identity of aim and method, it has become a common habit to regard the I. W. W. as of foreign inspiration and origin. Now, it is true that there are many foreigners in the I. W. W., many aliens who are wholly unassimilated, but it is not less true that the origins of the movement were notably American, quite as

OF BOLSHEVISM

much so as the origins of either the Republican Party or the National Security League, for example.

The I. W. W. grew out of the Western Federation of Miners and the experience of that most militant labor organization is the most bitter and brutal industrial struggles in our history. In the great series of strikes in Colorado and Idaho there was much inhuman savagery on both sides. Much has been said and written of the crimes committed on the side of the strikers, but little indeed of those crimes, both more terrible and more numerous, committed on the other side. In the mining districts of Colorado especially, there was set up a lawless, brutal, oppressive dictatorship of the capitalists as infamous as it was foolish and shortsighted. It respected no law and no lawful rights, which stood in the way of its rapacious ambitions. By its oppressive and terroristic policies it developed the desperate recklessness and unreasoning hate from which the I. W. W. was destined to grow.

X

To understand the spread of Bolshevik agitation and sympathy among a very con-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

siderable part of the working-class in this country, we must take into account the fact that its logical and natural nucleus is the I. W. W. It is necessary also to emancipate our minds from the obsession that only "ignorant foreigners" are affected. This is not a true estimate of either the I. W. W. or the Bolshevik propaganda as a whole. There are indeed many of this class in both, but there are also very many native Americans, sturdy, self-reliant, enterprising, and courageous men. The peculiar group psychology which we are compelled to study is less the result of those subtle and complex factors which are comprehended in the vague term "race," than of the political and economic conditions by which the group concerned is environed.

Naturally, our greatest interest lies in understanding why Americans who appear to be entirely typical in all other respects, develop such a passionate hatred for and distrust of the laws, institutions, and customs which are so highly regarded by their fellows of all classes. Why should native-born Americans, taught in our schools, nurtured under our traditions, be so hostile to the juridical system we have regarded as nearly ideal, the bulwark of personal freedom and the guar-

OF BOLSHEVISM

antee of equality before the law? Why should men of our soil and our speech, the soil and speech of Lincoln, be so contemptuous of those ideals, usages, and traditions we seek to summarize in the term "Americanism?" The alien worker whose intellectual and moral experience is rooted elsewhere, in lands where autocratic rule has made government synonymous with despotism, belongs to a separate category and must be separately studied. His impulses and his mental processes are different.

The typical native born I. W. W. member, the "Wobbly" one frequently encounters in our mid-Western and Western cities, is very unlike the hideous and repulsive figure conjured up by sensational cartoonists. He is much more likely to be a very attractive sort of man. Here are some characteristics of the type: Figure robust, sturdy and virile; dress rough but not unclean; speech forthright, deliberate and bold; features intelligent, frank and free from signs of alcoholic dissipation; movements slow and leisurely as of one averse to over-exertion. There are thousands of "Wobblies" to whom the specifications of this description will apply. Conversation with these men reveals that, as a general rule, they

THE PSYCHOLOGY

are above rather than below the average in sobriety. They are generally free from family ties, being either unmarried or, as often happens, wife-deserters. They are not highly educated, few having attended any school beyond the grammar school grade. Many of them have, however, read a great deal more than the average man, though their reading has been curiously miscellaneous in selection and nearly always badly balanced. Theology, philosophy, sociology, and economics seem to attract most attention. In discussion—and every "Wobbly" seems to possess a passion for disputation—men of this type will manifest a surprising familiarity with the broad outlines of certain theological problems, as well as with the scriptural texts bearing upon them. It is very likely to be the case, however, that they have only read a few popular classics of what used to be called Rationalism—Paine's *Age of Reason*, Ingersoll's lectures in pamphlet form, and Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe*, are typical. A surprisingly large number can quote extensively from Buckle's *History of Civilization* and from the writings of Marx. They quote statistics freely—statistics of wages, poverty, crime, vice, and so on—generally derived from the radical press and im-

OF BOLSHEVISM

plicitly believed because so published with what they accept as adequate authority.

So far, we see in the physical, mental, and moral characteristics of this type only wholesome, normal American workingmen of more than average intelligence and force of character. Their most marked peculiarity is the migratory nature of their lives. Whether this is self-determined, a matter of temperament and habit, or due to uncontrollable factors, it is largely responsible for the contempt in which they are popularly held. It naturally brings upon them the reproach and resentment everywhere visited upon "tramps" and "vagabonds." They rarely remain long enough in any one place to form local attachments and ties or anything like civic pride. They move from job to job, city to city, state to state, sometimes tramping afoot, begging as they go; sometimes stealing rides on railway trains, in freight cars—"side door Pullmans"—or on the rods underneath the cars. Frequently arrested for begging, trespassing or stealing rides, they are often the victims of injustice at the hands of local judges and justices. The absence of friends, combined with the prejudice against vagrants which everywhere exists, subjects them to arbitrary and

THE PSYCHOLOGY

high-handed injustice such as no other body of American citizens have to endure. Moreover, through the conditions of their existence they are readily suspected of crimes they do not commit: it is all too easy for the hard-pushed police officer or sheriff to impute a crime to the lone and defenseless "Wobbly," who frequently can produce no testimony to prove his innocence, simply because he has no friends in the neighborhood and has been at pains to conceal his movements. In this manner the "Wobbly" becomes a veritable son of Ishmael, his hand against the hand of nearly every man in conventional society. In particular he becomes a rebel by habit, hating the police and the courts as his constant enemies.

Nor are these the only evil fruits of the life of the migratory workers. Even more terrible and disastrous in its consequences is the fact that they are virtually excluded from citizenship, not because of any crime committed but simply because they are doing what is, for society as now organized, absolutely necessary. Doubtless the great majority of these men are temperamentally predisposed to the unanchored, adventurous, migratory existence which they lead. Boys so constituted run away to sea, take jobs with

OF BOLSHEVISM

traveling circuses, or enlist as soldiers. The type is familiar and not uncommon. Such individuals cannot be content with the prosaic, hum-drum, monotonous life of regular employment. As a rule we do not look upon this trait in boy or man as criminal.

The nature of our industrial life and the manner of its development are such that masses of such workers are imperatively required. England has needed, and still needs, her army of "navvies," the laborers employed in making railways, docks, canals, and so forth; men who move from job to job, inhabit cheap lodging houses, and know no permanent abode. We need, and shall continue to need, until we radically change our ways, great masses of "floating labor." Harvesting of the wheat crop in the Northwest calls for an army of men who can only be temporarily employed. The same is true of the harvesting of the fruit crop in California and elsewhere. The army finds its way into the wheat belt, self-mobilized as it were, and later finds its way into the fruit-belt. The lumber industry moves from place to place like an immense, ravaging monster-locust. It enters a well-timbered district, remains a little while and leaves a ragged, dreary, for-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

lorn waste. It builds camps instead of cities. It does not want citizens, men with civic ideals and responsibilities. On the contrary, it wants men content to be camp-dwellers, content to live under abnormal conditions, without home and family life.

Some future day may bring about such a reorganization of our industrial life, such a degree of standardization, as will make such "floating labor," with its abnormal living conditions, unnecessary. In the meantime, however, it is necessary and its disappearance would be attended by economic disaster. Yet we penalize the men who provide this labor by excluding them from the privileges of citizenship. This we do indirectly, but effectively, by making the right to vote, in national as well as local elections, dependent upon residential qualifications which the migratory worker can rarely meet. A fixed residence for a definite period of time, personal appearance for registration on fixed dates in order to vote, forfeiture of the right to vote as a result of moving within certain periods of time, even in pursuit of employment—these are the devices which make of our migratory workers a disfranchised class, a proletariat of a peculiarly helpless kind.

OF BOLSHEVISM

Many a hardworking, intelligent American, who from choice or from necessity, is a migratory worker, following his job, never has an opportunity to vote for State legislators, for Governor, for Congressman or President. He is just as effectively excluded from the actual electorate as if he were a Chinese coolie, ignorant of our customs and our speech.

We cannot wonder that such conditions prove prolific breeders of Bolshevism and similar "isms." It would be strange indeed if it were otherwise. We have no right to expect that men who are so constantly the victims of arbitrary, unjust, and even brutal treatment at the hands of our police and our courts will manifest any reverence for the law and the judicial system. Respect for majority rule in government cannot fairly be demanded from a disfranchised group. It is not to be wondered at that the old slogan of Socialism, "Strike at the ballot-box!" the call to lift the struggle of the classes to the parliamentary level, for peaceful settlement, becomes the desperate, anarchistic I. W. W. slogan, "Strike at the ballot-box with an ax!" Men who can have no family life cannot justly be expected to bother about school administra-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

tion. Men who can have no home life, but only dreary shelter in crowded work-camps or dirty doss-houses are not going to bother themselves with municipal housing reforms.

In short, we must wake up to the fact that, as the very heart of our problem, we have a Bolshevik nucleus in America composed of virile, red-blooded Americans, racy of our soil and history, whose conditions of life and labor are such as to develop in them the psychology of reckless, despairing, revengeful Bolshevism. They really are little concerned with theories of the State and of social development, which to our Intellectuals seem to be the essence of Bolshevism. They are vitally concerned only with action. Syndicalism and Bolshevism involve speedy and drastic action—hence the force of their appeal. In the name of democracy we have permitted oppression, and now the oppressed, revolting, menace democracy. The American workingman who is a Bolshevik or a sympathizer with Bolshevism, is, in all except rare and exceptional instances, a victim of great and real wrongs which have steeped his consciousness in hatred and bitter resentment.

OF BOLSHEVISM

XI

With the exception of the migratory occupations, in which Americans are largely employed, the I. W. W. has gained its principal following among foreign-speaking workers of recent immigration, mainly those belonging to the so-called "unskilled occupations." Long ago, John Stuart Mill pointed out the absurdity of this designation, and directed attention to the fact that most of such occupations require a considerable degree of skill and ability of one kind or another. Farm laborers are always classified as unskilled laborers, for example, but whoever has tried to plow a field, or to sow a field of oats, knows that these are tasks requiring very much skill. The old and quite inaccurate term survives, however, despite its absurdity, because it serves the useful purpose of distinguishing between occupations which require a considerable period of apprenticeship and those which can be reasonably well performed by any person of normal intelligence after very brief demonstration and experiment.

To supply labor of this kind we have in recent years depended largely upon immigration from European nations. Millions of im-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

migrants, mostly peasants, have poured into our great industrial centers from Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Greece, the Balkan countries, and Spain. They have been drawn to our country by the overpowering lure of the magic word "America," with its promise of wealth and of freedom from tyrannical and despotic government, from social and religious persecution, from militarism, and from never-ending poverty. Some have had the advantages of elementary education and possess some appreciation of the great problems of modern society. Others have been illiterate and ignorant, wholly incapable of intelligently appreciating the tasks confronting a democratic society.

In our feverish efforts to insure an abundant supply of labor we have not made any distinction between literate and illiterate. So long as the needs of the immediate present were met we have cared nothing for the future. We have permitted our factories and our cities to be filled with people of alien speech, and have not deemed it necessary to take steps to place them in possession of that most elementary requisite for normal and efficient life, the language of the land. We have permitted these people to be crowded into

OF BOLSHEVISM

slums where they are herded like cattle; to be victimized and cruelly exploited by the cunning and unscrupulous; to be made industrial slaves. Until the great war revealed the peril of these conditions and shocked us into doing something about it, we ignored these things. We took little trouble to see that justice was done to the immigrant laborers and their families; we cared nothing for what they thought; we were ignorant of and indifferent to their thoughts and their feelings. When such workers from time to time revolted and protested in the only manner available to them, or that they comprehended, too commonly they were repressed and silenced in the most brutal manner. Their contacts with our police and our courts have, far too often, left these aliens, naturalized and unnaturalized alike, wondering wherein American democracy was freer or juster than Old World autocracy.

For reasons which it is unnecessary to consider in detail here, the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated unions have not been very successful in organizing this unskilled proletariat of alien origin. The critics of the American movement charge that its leaders have practically ignored these un-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

skilled workers. The leaders thus accused deny the charge: they point to numerous attempts which have ended in comparative failure; they emphasize the fact that the creation of stable and strong organizations of unskilled workers is always and everywhere exceedingly difficult because supply is normally greater than demand, especially where there is a constant reinforcement by immigration, and that • the task becomes immeasurably more difficult when there are many nationalities and races, divided by barriers of language, religion, customs, and racial antagonisms. Finally, they point to the fact that the employers in the industries most affected have made it a special policy to break up the unions of such workers, resorting to every brutal and corrupt means to achieve this end.

Whatever the cause of the failure of the American Federation of Labor, the result has been the opportunity of the I. W. W. which the latter has seized and used. It cannot be said to have been more successful than the American Federation of Labor in creating enduring organizations. This is evidenced by the fact that in those industrial centers in which its greatest battles have been fought—McKee's Rocks, Lawrence, Paterson—no

OF BOLSHEVISM

strong and lasting organization has resulted. The leaders of the I. W. W. say, indeed, that this is not their aim. They do not want to create enduring organizations, they say, but only temporary ones for strike purposes. They do not aim to create organizations which will negotiate with the employers and from time to time adjust difficulties and make agreements. They want war and disorder, not peaceable agreement and orderly development. Thus it is when the flames of discontent arise that the I. W. W. comes upon the scene, drawn by the scent of strife as buzzards are drawn to carrion. It is true, as one of the best known of our labor leaders has said, that "I. W. W. employers are mainly responsible for I. W. W. unions." Agitators of the I. W. W. do not make the discontent: they only give it leadership. There is a lesson for America in the saying of an English statesman, "Fools talk of agitators, there is but one—injustice."

To this great mass of oppressed and discontented alien workers the I. W. W. brings a message of extreme plausibility, welcome and easily accepted because it promises precisely what is desired. The unions belonging to the Federation of Labor are bitterly assailed for caring for the interests of particular crafts at

THE PSYCHOLOGY

the expense of the entire working-class. They are accused, not without justice, of capitalistic methods and motives, as, for example, when they exact high membership fees. When these alien workers are told that the entrance fees which some American unions have charged have ranged from twenty-five to five hundred dollars, that the glass-blowers' organization, for example, some years ago charged an entrance fee of five hundred dollars and seriously contemplated a special entrance rate of one thousand dollars for "foreigners," they are easily inspired with distrust of the whole movement. By playing upon their sufferings it is easy to inspire the belief that our democracy, from which they expected so much, is a sham and no better than autocracy. Bitter denunciations of nationalism, and emotional appeals to a crude doctrine of universalism, miscalled internationalism, find ready response.

Such, briefly indicated, are the conditions and the experiences which, before the war and the revolutionary uprisings in Europe, had already produced in this country a great body of discontent and despair of democracy, seeing no hope in anything but Syndicalism. The revolutionary movements in Russia and

OF BOLSHEVISM

throughout Europe, arising out of war conditions, have given new names to the old ideas, kindled new hopes of success and brought immense reinforcements of numbers and of courage and faith. But the central fact of cardinal importance is that before the war and before the Russian Revolution, in the normal times and conditions of peace, we had already developed, in the manner described, the nucleus of a formidable and potentially dangerous Bolshevik movement. War and war's aftermath have increased the army of revolt. It is not so difficult after all to understand the psychology of this army of revolt.

XII

In modern society, war, when it is extensive and long continued, is a great breeder of revolutionary discontent, particularly in those countries which do not have the actual presence of overpowering invading armies to force the population into abnormal solidarity. The great loss of human life, the large numbers of maimed and broken men, heavy taxation, profiteering, inflated prices, privation, forced military service, disrupted homes, interrupted business, unfamiliar and harsh

THE PSYCHOLOGY

military restrictions in civil life—these and a host of other evils incidental to modern warfare produce a sort of war neurosis. Irritability of temper and querulousness become common. The people are more easily moved to riotous demonstrations. Workers in factories and workshops are more ready to quarrel than in normal times. Strikes frequently become epidemic, the most trivial incidents sufficing to bring about strikes of considerable magnitude. The disturbing influence of “war nerves” has been observed in many countries during the past five years.

It was inevitable that the conditions produced by the war should lead to the development in this country, especially among certain groups of wage-earners, of a psychological predisposition to Bolshevism, a highly developed suggestibility arising from nervous over-tension. While it is fortunately true, on the one hand, that in no country were there so many ameliorative factors, to act as social sedatives as it were, it is equally true that, as a result of our great racially diversified polyglot, unassimilated population, and the peculiar conditions which governed their immigration to this country, we were subject to peculiarly strong irritants. Not even in that

OF BOLSHEVISM

most cosmopolitan and racially heterogeneous of European countries, Austria, could there be found greater racial heterogeneity, with resulting diversity of racial sympathies and personal ties, than existed here in these United States. Millions of people either born in enemy countries or sons and daughters of parents who were so born, having many ties of kindred with those countries, near relatives and dear friends fighting in their armies, were forced to practice extraordinary emotional repression. Psychic overstrain, long continued, became the biggest factor in the psychology of millions of people.

To the ordinary emotional strain of anxiety and fear borne by all with loved ones in the fighting ranks, or with great material interests at stake, for an appreciable part of our population there was added the terrible strain of compulsory repression of natural emotions and normal sympathies. Among our wage-earners this overstrain fell, in large part, upon those who by reason of recent arrival, lack of assimilation to the new land and its ways, defective education and, consequently, of self-discipline, were least fitted to hear it. Take, for instance, the attitude toward militarism and conscription: The average American

THE PSYCHOLOGY

born citizen of American born parentage has grown up with no knowledge of militarism as that term is understood in Europe. He has regarded it as one of the evils of the Old World attendant upon monarchical and dynastic rule. In a general way, he has always known that in case of need every able-bodied citizen could be drafted to bear arms for the defense of the nation. But this possibility has seemed remote and compulsory military service only an incident in life, at most. He has never felt the pressure of militarism as a system, causing him to want to migrate to some other land to escape as from a deadly plague. He has never borne the burden of crushing taxation for the upkeep of a great military caste. He has never known what it meant to live in a land whose politics and governmental policies were governed by considerations of military strategy. He has known nothing of the brutal despotism inseparable from such a system. He has not realized the meaning of a power in the State arbitrarily taking millions of young men and compelling them, against their will, to give some of the best years of their life to fit the plans of an autocratically, or bureaucratically, governed military machine.

OF BOLSHEVISM

But all these things, which to the American of native-parentage were only a terrible phantasy, as little real as the warfare of the gods in the mythologies, were tragically real to millions of our people. It was to escape from this monster, and to save their children from its relentless maws, that millions of them endured the privations, the sacrifices, and the painful sundering of ties of family and kindred, to establish themselves in the New World, where the monster did not dwell, and where, as they believed, he could not come. All that, and more than that, they felt implied in American democracy. They found here no great standing army; no arrogant military caste; no subordination of politics and government to military strategy; no crushing burden of taxation for a military machine so vast that it bore, an Atlantean load, upon the shoulders of every laborer, and cast a shadow over every cradle.

Then came our entrance into a war more extensive and more terrible than any in all the previous history of mankind. The theater of the war was thousands of miles away. Its origins were obscure—obscured by much discussion and dispute. The greatest pacific nation in the world set itself to the

THE PSYCHOLOGY

task of militarizing itself, of creating the greatest military machine which its human and material resources made possible. We directed our genius and our might from the arts of peace to the arts of war. Our mighty engines of industry groaned under the new urge and produced the ghastly implements of death and destruction. Conscription was ordered and the fairest and strongest of our sons were sternly called from their homes to wear khaki uniforms, to bear arms, and to cross the seas as warriors. As if some evil magician had willed to change the New World and make it like the Old World, our streets and public places echoed military marching; a great load of taxation was imposed upon the people; our liberties of movement, of assemblage, of speech, and of publication were narrowed and restricted by rules born of military strategy.

Tragically terrible as all this was, the great mass of the people accepted it with quiet courage, confident that it would not long endure. There was an American tradition to sustain that faith. Little more than half a century before there had been conscription and military rule, so alien to our democratic ideals, but when the emergency was passed

OF BOLSHEVISM

and the great task completed the nation threw off the military incubus as a man throws off an old coat, and returned to the normal ways of industry and peace. So doubtless, it would be again. Sustained by this faith, and accepting as true the splendid assurances of high democratic purpose made by President Wilson in phrases of inspired sublimity, the nation accepted, with remarkable unanimity, the theory that the necessities of the war required and justified the temporary surrender of valued liberties. The people were ready and willing to make this sacrifice to the noble idealism which gave to the war the character of a great spiritual adventure.

Even the leaders of liberal and radical opinion, with very few exceptions, steeled their minds and hearts to acquiescence in these dangerous expedients. Many of them felt, doubtless, that there was great danger of creating, while fighting for democracy abroad, an intolerable despotism at home. Doubtless many foresaw that the liberties thus surrendered in a fervor of patriotism would be hard to restore, involving a long and bitter struggle. But they saw no hope for democratic ideals here or elsewhere in the world unless and until the greatest military

THE PSYCHOLOGY

empire in the world was broken and its power to crush the liberties of the world destroyed. So these men and women accepted the logic of their faith and with the rest of the nation clad their souls in khaki and fought for freedom for all mankind.

But there were millions among us whose position was infinitely more tragic and difficult. How terrible their disappointment and despair must have been when they saw arise here in the Promised Land into which they had so lately entered the very monster to escape from which they had left the Old World! It was, in fact, much harder to bear the burdens of war and military necessity in America than it would have been to bear similar or heavier burdens in the lands from which they came. The new order which came into being with such cyclonic rapidity was more than a physical burden: it was the death of a cherished ideal passionately loved—the ideal of America as a land free from the terrible scourge of militarism. Here, as in Russia, as in Austria, as in Germany, the State took the flower of the young manhood of the nation to make soldiers—"cannon fodder." Here, as in those lands from which they had torn themselves, industry was diverted to

OF BOLSHEVISM

military ends. Here, too, the soldiers' trade was now idealized, and here, too, a great system of espionage and sedition laws and military regulations put an end to the freedom "to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience." Moreover, the fierce outburst of national patriotism seemed to produce here the bitter and terrible hatred of whole peoples which they had seen bear such bitter and deadly fruit in the Old World.

When we remember these things it is not a matter for wonder that Bolshevism found in such minds a fertile soil. It is not difficult to understand, or even to sympathize with, the psychological state thus produced. The whole experience of hundreds of thousands of such people tended to make difficult, and even absolutely impossible, understanding and acceptance of our rôle in the great war. On the other hand, it was extremely easy to accept the view that the idealism expressed by the President and other exponents of the nation's purpose and policy was hypocritical; that the Government had declared war at the behest of capitalists who wanted war for the sake of profit; that militarism was to be permanently fastened upon the people. It was easy to embrace the crude universalism, call-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

ing itself internationalism, which proposed to end all forms of nationalism and all national rivalries and animosities. They were of the working-class, conscious, as every intelligent person must be, of a great divergence of interest between themselves and the capitalist class whether at home or abroad, and of a commonality of interests with all workers everywhere. But they were blind to the parallel phenomenon of interests common to all classes. They saw here the same gulf separating rich and poor, the same extremes of wealth and poverty. They saw that here in America, just as in every other land, the wage-earner must struggle with fierce intensity to obtain the requisites of a decent existence. Surely, the real struggle of the moment, the one war that was worthy, was the class war—the workers of all lands against the masters of bread and life.

In pre-war times, the fat days of peace, we had given little heed to the vast problem of assimilating the hordes of laborers drawn from all over the world. We exploited them but did little else. We did not trouble to understand them, to make them understand us. We cared only that they came in numbers large enough and remained docile

OF BOLSHEVISM

enough. Perhaps it was because our ideals were time-worn, and we ourselves cynical concerning them, that we hardly tried to inspire them with any vision of America as a nation striving to attain an ideal of communism of opportunity. The richest and rarest gift they had to bestow, a passionate yearning for democratic freedom and justice and a fierce hatred of despotism and injustice—gifts more lastingly valuable than their labor, even—we contemptuously ignored. Too late, when the war came, we realized that there was peril in the presence in our midst of masses who, even when naturalized, were not fully American; who lacked that deeply rooted faith in our institutions, and that unshakable trust in our purpose, which are essential to the highest and most enduring patriotism.

XIII

The sense of peril thus suddenly thrust into our consciousness, together with the realization of the brutality and unscrupulous intriguing and plotting of the enemy, developed a highly hysterical policy of repression. In all too many cases we became as

THE PSYCHOLOGY

brutally savage as the Prussians. The savagery of many of the sentences imposed by our courts for violation of the laws relating to sedition was equalled only by their stupidity. We failed, all too often, to distinguish between actual obstruction of our military enterprise, whether designed or accidental, and the simple expression of honest doubts, fears, and reservations which honest men may entertain without treason or malice in their hearts. Earnest and loyal liberals of many schools of thought witnessed these blundering travesties of justice and democracy with heavy hearts. They knew that no surer method could be devised for fostering the thing called Bolshevism, which arises from unfaith in democracy. They knew that such sentences fell upon harmless and innocent people as often as upon those who were dangerous and guilty. And they knew that every persecution of this kind made it harder for millions of honest men and women in our own and allied nations to believe in our democratic intentions.

For utterances far less seriously critical of our war policy than many that were freely made in the parliaments of our allies, and even of our enemies, men and women were

OF BOLSHEVISM

condemned to long terms of imprisonment. In the great State of New York, an American, said to be a lineal descendant from one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, in a heated informal argument which took place in a lunch wagon, was alleged to have said that the Government was rotten; that many of its officials were corrupt; that he would rather be jailed than conscripted to fight, and that he was a Socialist. It can hardly be argued that from these utterances any serious impairment of our military effort could result. Thoughtful men must believe that such incidents could well be ignored; that the force of opinion against him was overwhelming. In the event of his actually resisting conscription if and when drafted, that offense could be dealt with readily enough. *But he was actually sentenced to ten years' imprisonment and the sentence is being served!*

In Iowa a man opposed to conscription circulated a leaflet opposing the re-election of the Congressmen who voted for that measure. *He was sentenced to imprisonment for twenty years!* For writing to a Kansas City newspaper the statement "No government which is for the profiteers can also be for the people, and I am for the people while the govern-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

ment is for the profiteers," Mrs. Stokes was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, upon the theory that such a statement obstructed recruiting, and caused or was intended to cause insubordination and mutiny in the military forces. That her declaration actually had any of these results is extremely improbable. That her views could be far more effectively combated by reasoned argument and demonstration by the government of the untruth of her charge than by imprisonment is more than probable. That the sentence was violently excessive and unjust is certain. The same may be said of the equally indefensible sentences imposed in the case of Mr. Debs and many others.

Thousands of liberals and radicals who had devoted themselves to the common task of winning the war, reeled under the shock of these savage sentences—so much more severe than those meted out to similar offenders in other lands, including Germany. To remain silent and unprotesting in the face of wrongs so grievous seemed like a desertion of their principles and ideals, like treason to conscience. Yet they could make no effective public protest without giving encouragement and strength to the anti-war agitators and aid

OF BOLSHEVISM

and comfort to the enemy. It was a position involving intense mental and spiritual struggle and torture. They realized the imperative need of a manifestation of unbroken solidarity. They could not cry out, what indeed they felt, that in our democratic system it was all too easy and too frequent for tyranny and oppression to rule. They could only decide to "carry on" while making such protests, and such efforts to bring about a more sane and worthy policy, as could be made without endangering the solidarity and morale of the nation. Beyond this they could only trust that President Wilson would seize an early opportunity to end an intolerable condition by granting a general amnesty, as soon as hostilities ceased, or even earlier, applying to all persons imprisoned for the expression of opinions hostile to the war and to our military policies, to all offenders against the sedition and espionage laws rather than those guilty of acts of violence, directly communicating with the enemy or service of any kind in the pay of the enemy.

The noble and generous spirit in which President Wilson had defined our aims and ideals warranted the utmost confidence that he would not fail to seize the opportunity to

THE PSYCHOLOGY

prove the nation magnanimous; that he at least would sympathetically comprehend the moral overstrain which had led to technical violations of the law, and the rankling sense of injustice which must inevitably result from vindictiveness. No one who has ever discussed such matters with him can doubt that he earnestly desires to temper justice with human sympathy and understanding. But the President found himself caught in the grip of relentless circumstance, struggling under a burden of incredible heaviness, and, unfortunately for America and for his own fame as a great liberal statesman-idealist, the golden opportunity was missed. Neither the signing of the Armistice nor the signing of the Treaty of Peace brought the amnesty which political wisdom and democratic idealism alike suggested.

It is impossible to over-estimate the extent to which the savage vindictiveness of our treatment of such offenders against the sedition and espionage laws has contributed to the growth of Bolshevism. It is likewise impossible to measure the harmful effects of that vindictiveness upon the morale of our Allies during the war. In the summer of 1918 in England, France, and Italy it was the ex-

OF BOLSHEVISM

perience of the present writer to be continually called upon to explain to puzzled minds how a nation could possibly be sincere in its professions that it was fighting to "make the world safe for democracy" while permitting the most astounding and vindictive sentences, such as were frequently reported in the press. The anti-war Socialists, the bourgeois pacifists, and the reactionary pro-German groups made this the theme of a very influential propaganda. Even the most active and energetic supporters of the war among the Socialists and Laborites, were depressed by the inconsistency of our practice with our professions. It is not an exaggeration to say that no possible agitation which the anti-war agitators could have carried on in this country could have so depressed the morale of the masses, and of their most thoughtful leaders, as did the news of the severity and injustice with which we punished men and women for silly, bombastic talk.

Rarely in the history of the world, and never in the memory of living men, has any individual possessed such an extraordinary influence over the minds of masses of people in many lands as President Wilson possessed during the last year of the war. No one who was

THE PSYCHOLOGY

privileged to come into close contact with the civil population in England, Belgium, France, and Italy, or with the common troops of those countries, could fail to realize the remarkable trust in President Wilson, the ready and eager response to and faith in his utterances. War-wearied men and women crushed with grief and despair rallied under the magic spell of his words, which they cried in the streets and in the trenches with almost fanatical enthusiasm. Statesmen, diplomatists, politicians, great capitalists, and high military officers might be cold and cynical, but the masses were inspired. In an Italian city an immense audience of workingmen, weary of the war, desperate from privation and suffering, sullen, distrustful, and ready for peace at any price, was transformed by the simple mention of President Wilson and became at once a mass inspired by faith and enthusiasm which were invincible. The President had spoken the thoughts, the hopes, and the ideals with which the souls of peoples were burdened. To his intellectual perceptions and judgments there was added a spiritual force, a prophetic vision and utterance possessed by no other leader of men in any of the war-stricken nations. Even the enemy prisoners

OF BOLSHEVISM

in the great concentration camps thrilled with the passion of a new hope when they read his words. Here was no mere trick of rhetoric, but the rarer gift of prophetic fire.

Could the President have realized the meaning of the worshipful affection in which he was held, and the source of it, he could have dealt Bolshevism in every land a blow far more harmful to it than armies of millions could inflict. Great as his service to mankind at the Peace Conference admittedly was, supremely great as his achievements must be regarded when measured by the traditional standards of statesmanship, it must be admitted that he proved unequal to the greatest opportunity which destiny placed before him. In the supreme moment of his life and of the history of the modern world, he seemed to lose something vital, something of that prophetic greatness which he had shown in the dark days of tragic strife. Perhaps he lost it when he decided to be one of the plenipotentiaries, to sit at the conference table where compromise, intrigue, and barter were inevitable. Perhaps he might have retained it if he had gone to Versailles saying, "The United States will not permit her representatives to sit in closed rooms! they will only

THE PSYCHOLOGY

confer in public and in the hearing of all mankind. Nor will the United States be party to any policy which by its severity will keep alive the sense of hatred among those who have been our enemies." Granted the responsibility of the German people for the war, and not merely the former rulers of Germany, the fact remains that the unborn generation cannot be held responsible. When President Wilson seemed to descend to the plane of the old order of statesmanship, to methods so nearly akin to those of Baron Sonino, M. Clemenceau, and Mr. Lloyd George there was an immediate revulsion of feeling, a great wave of disappointment, and Bolshevism gained new strength.

Similarly the failure of the President to proclaim a generous spirit as the one fitting form of national thanksgiving, and to declare a general amnesty, strengthened Bolshevism in this country. Those of his fellow-countrymen who had best understood and most approved his idealism expected that the President would have eagerly grasped at the opportunity to exhort the nation to celebrate the victory by a return to democratic ways of living. He might well have pointed out the profound spiritual crisis which the war brought

OF BOLSHEVISM

to many sincere American citizens, as well as to many unnaturalized aliens; that while the exigencies of the struggle in which the nation found itself made necessary severe repression, with the coming of peace the old toleration of minority opinion should be restored. If autocratic and despotic monarchical rulers have almost invariably celebrated the victories of their armies by setting free all their subjects imprisoned for sedition and similar offenses, should a democracy be less generous and forgiving?

The leaders of American Bolshevism feared more than anything else that President Wilson would act in this democratic manner. There was nothing which he could do so injurious to their cause as to proclaim a general amnesty. By so doing, he would have robbed them of one of their most potent appeals. These Bolshevik leaders have protested publicly in the most vociferous manner against the severity of the sentences imposed upon many pacifists and anti-war agitators, and have demanded that the President declare an amnesty. But while they have done this they have hoped that the President would turn a deaf ear to their demand. This is not a statement based upon conjecture, but a simple

THE PSYCHOLOGY

statement of fact. Immediately after the Armistice was signed, the present writer was asked to join in a big public protest against the continued imprisonment of the men and women convicted for the expression of anti-war sentiments and opinions, and a demand for immediate general amnesty. It was proposed that in this movement a number of well-known Anarchists, Syndicalists, Bolsheviks, and anti-war Socialists should take active part.

To this invitation the writer replied by setting forth that if the demand for such action by the President should come from men and women whose course during the war had been so hostile and so contrary to the heart and will of the nation, it would be exceedingly difficult for the President to act as requested, even though he might be very anxious to do so. On the other hand, such a request coming from a body of men and women of unimpeachable loyalty, who had given conspicuous support to the Government during the war, would be easily granted, should the President so desire. The reply received was highly instructive, and throws a flood of light upon the mental processes of those back of the movement: "No doubt you are right. The

OF BOLSHEVISM

psychology of your argument is sound. It is very likely that if your method should be followed the amnesty would be granted at once. But in that case the whole propaganda value of these persecutions will be lost to us. We do not want the President to proclaim a general amnesty, nor to pardon any of the prisoners, unless it is plainly done because of the menace of our movement. We want agitation far more than we want amnesty."

This temper is easily understood. Men whose stock in trade is incessant protest against grievances real or imaginary fear more than anything else under the sun the removal of their grievances. "What a miserable world it would be if there were no misery in it," exclaimed a cynical reformer. Many an earnest would-be-savior of mankind would be very unhappy indeed if mankind should actually be saved after all. A glimmering of this truth occasionally found its way into the official mind. At the time of the acquittal of Scott Nearing, an important official in the Department of Washington said, when news of the verdict was received, "Nearing is acquitted. Nearing has lost and we have won." Had that wisdom governed the actions of the Department of Justice in relation to the

THE PSYCHOLOGY

recalcitrant minority during the war, there would be fewer sympathizers with Bolshevism today.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Bolshevism is the madness of men goaded to desperation and despair by a profound sense of injustice. Every form of oppression and tyranny feeds its flames. No display of force can intimidate or crush it. Nothing but evil can come from reliance upon brute force after the fashion of the former rulers of Russia. There is only one force which can kill Bolshevism, namely, justice. A democratic people has neither the right nor the need to place its dependence upon any other force. A Debs in prison is not silenced really. Whatever there was of error, of bitterness, or of peril in his speeches in war days, reappears, magnified many thousandfold, in the influence which radiates from his prison cell to every part of the United States. To place the stigma of a criminal upon men like Debs is to remove the stigma from crime itself. Men who think that they can beat Bolshevism out of the heads of bewildered and misguided men, or that they can imprison its spirit in narrow cells, are as harsh and undemocratic

OF BOLSHEVISM

in their souls, and as ignorant of life, as ever any czar or kaiser in history was.

Every society is imperiled in which there resides a class steeped in misery, hopeless, believing that no sort can be for the worse. The feeling of having "nothing to lose," when it is held by any considerable number of persons, is a destructive force in the heart of society, so much dynamite under the foundations of the social order ready to be exploded at the first opportunity or provocation. History is replete with impressive examples of this truth. When one considers what has happened in Russia since March, 1917, it is natural to recall the terrible results of the appeals to the spirit of destruction and revenge made by that strange, sinister figure, Stenka Razin, who, at the time of Catherine the Great, preached violence, looting, and wanton destruction of property. Razin had hosts of followers all over the land. His propaganda attained the dimensions of a formidable crusade. Many thousands of peasants forsook their work to follow and obey him. The movement kindled intense enthusiasm and seemed destined permanently to ruin Russia. The secret of Razin's power was the poverty and despair of the oppressed

THE PSYCHOLOGY

masses. He said to them: *You are hungry, but there is food: seize the food and possess it. You are in rags, but there is fine raiment in abundance: seize the raiment of the rich and wear it. You live in hovels like swine, but there are mansions and palaces: enter these and make them your homes. Drive away the idle rich who live upon you like leeches. Strip them naked. Take all they have, use what you can and destroy the rest. Ply the torch freely. Down with the rich idler.* This was the entire substance of his appeal, preached with fiery zeal. He preached not a single constructive thought or measure. But there were numerous thousands to heed his mad counsels, saying, "There is nothing else. We have nothing to lose; things cannot be worse."

XIV

The tragic failure of the governments of the Entente nations to comprehend the situation in Russia, and their uniformly blundering policy in dealing with that unhappy nation, have sown the seeds of Bolshevism broadcast throughout the world. It is, indeed, almost impossible to apply the word "policy"

OF BOLSHEVISM

to a course of action so erratic, so inconsistent, and so unintelligible as that of the Allied Nations in dealing with Russia. In this respect the record of our own Government is neither better nor worse than that of the least democratic and progressive of our allies. Had it been their purpose to strengthen and bolster up the régime of Lenine and Trotzky, the Allied Nations could not have reasonably expected to have accomplished more in that direction than they have done.

When the war began in August, 1914, the most democratic nations of Western Europe found themselves yoked to the infamous Romanov dynasty. It was inevitable that this alliance should bring forth much criticism, doubt, and uneasiness. Partnership with Russia in a war for freedom appeared as a grim, ironic jest. Liberal opinion in France and Great Britain had denounced the "Unholy Alliance" when it was first announced. There were popular demonstrations of mourning in France, hundreds of thousands of people wearing badges of crepe to symbolize their sense of shame and humiliation. Alliance with the Czar was a thing of which liberal minded men and women were ashamed. Many a patriotic Frenchman draped with

THE PSYCHOLOGY

somber black the tricolor of France. But when the war actually came it was soon seen that the alliance, however incongruous it might appear, was essential if France, Belgium, and Great Britain were to be saved from enslavement to Prussianism. It was evident that no small part of the burden of the war must be borne by Russia.

While this reconciled millions of Englishmen and Frenchmen to a partnership which they really despised and feared, there were many, including some of the best and most enlightened citizens of both countries, who could not be so reconciled. These could not seriously believe in the Czar as a defender of liberty and democracy. They could not believe that Nicholas II. and his government would fight for these ideals, or for any purpose other than the strengthening of the autocracy of the Romanovs. An Allied victory meant, and could only mean, a triumph of Czarism. It was all too easy and plausible, therefore, to say that France and Great Britain were fighting to uphold Czarism quite as much as they were fighting to destroy Prussian militarism. This argument, coupled with denunciation of the secret treaties with

OF BOLSHEVISM

Russia, played a large part in the pacifist agitation in France and Great Britain.

Those Socialists in the various allied countries, including Russia, who supported the war justified themselves by an appeal to the logic of Russia's economic life. While a definite and conclusive triumph by the Allied Nations over Germany and Austria, in which Russia shared, would undoubtedly strengthen the Czar and Czarism, that would be only a temporary effort, they said. In the long run the effect of such a victory would be to destroy the economic basis of Czarism. That basis, they pointed out, was feudalistic, not capitalistic. Czarism was possible only so long as Russia remained economically backward and undeveloped. A German triumph would prolong that condition, because it was essential to the German scheme that Russia should be kept in a state of economic subjection, a fruitful field for German exploitation, a country furnishing raw materials and purchasing manufactured goods, not herself a manufacturing country. From this point of view it was inevitable that a triumph over Germany would liberate Russia and lead to a great economic expansion, incompatible with

THE PSYCHOLOGY

feudalistic Czarism and requiring democratic constitutional government.

Of the soundness of this view there can hardly be any serious question on the part of any competent person. It is quite easy to see why it failed to satisfy those who were concerned with the immediate issue of the strengthening of Czarism: they saw the immediate evil far more clearly and vividly than they could see the remoter outcome of a relatively long evolutionary process. On the other hand, those who defended the association of the Western nations with Russia, and proclaimed that the triumph of the Allied Nations would be of great benefit to Russian democracy, however sincere they might be in their views, found it hard to defend or support the secret treaties.

When the Czar was dethroned and the Russian Republic was proclaimed, in March, 1917, the allies of Russia were confronted with a golden opportunity. Had there been in the chancelleries even the least understanding of the great revolutionary movement in Russia, the slightest comprehension of the psychology of the working-class of every country, they would have known that any attempt to hold the new Russia to the secret treaties entered

OF BOLSHEVISM

into with the old régime would be productive of distrust and, possibly, of disaster. Then was the time for a display of candor and of confidence in the masses. It was the time for saying to the new Provisional Government of Russia: "We entered into certain relations with the government of the Czar, and made certain agreements in the common interest for the effective prosecution of the war. In welcoming the new government which you have set up as a great democratic advance, we recognize that it would be unfair to expect you to be governed in such grave matters by agreements entered into without your knowledge or consent, and that you will desire some new agreements as well as new methods of making such agreements. To this end, we, your allies, suggest open and frank conference with a view to making any necessary revision of existing agreements." That there would have been any serious or dangerous change of military arrangements is highly improbable. The reiteration of loyalty to the Allied cause by the Russian leaders, and their open and sincere rejection of the idea of negotiations for a separate peace, afford the best possible evidence of this. But the statesmen and diplomatists of the Allied Nations lacked

THE PSYCHOLOGY

vision and missed their opportunity. Because of their failure, to a very large extent, Kerensky was doomed to defeat. In his heroic efforts to keep Russia in the fight he had to encounter the almost unanswerable argument: "These treaties were made by the Czar, for the purposes of Czarism. Now that the Czar is overthrown shall we still be governed by him, still be compelled to carry out his purposes? They are not our treaties: we are not bound by them."

The United States entered into the war after the overthrow of Czarism. We had no compromising military or political agreements with the old régime when we became, in fact if not technically and formally, Russia's ally. Without any sort of disloyalty to the other nations with whom we became allies in the same way and at the same time, we could have assured the Provisional Government of Russia that we would not be governed in our actions by any agreements made by the Czar's government with any other governments; that we were ready to discuss the basis of our co-operation with the new government of Russia, openly as befits a democracy dealing with another democracy. By such a declaration we could have struck a blow at

OF BOLSHEVISM

the suspicion and unfaith which were permitted to grow unchecked until the tragedy of Brest-Litovsk became inevitable. We spoke fair and even generous words to Russia, but we failed, just as France and Great Britain had failed, to act democratically toward the new democracy. We failed to see the absurdity of trying to hold the new Russia by the words of the old Czar.

Another splendid opportunity came to the statesmen of the Allied Nations when Kerensky, whose loyalty to the Allies was unimpeachable, called upon them to make a restatement of war aims. It was impressively clear that Kerensky was being pushed to the wall, and that only a statement of war aims free from imperialism, vibrant with democratic idealism—such a statement as President Wilson later made on more than one occasion with marvelously good effect—could hold Russia in line and make it possible for Kerensky to carry on his great work. Failure to meet that natural request was as criminal as it was stupid. It is possible, of course, that even had such a statement been forthcoming the military debacle of Russia would have occurred. But, on the other hand, it is possible that had the statement been forthcoming

THE PSYCHOLOGY

the debacle would have been averted, while without the statement the result was inevitable and easy to foresee. Failure to respond to Kerensky's appeal was equivalent to the betrayal of a brave and gallant servant of the common cause. It was also an inexcusable neglect of a great strategic opportunity to save the Eastern front.

Outside of Russia it was an error fraught with results scarcely less inimical to the Allied cause. In every country of the Allied Nations the failure to make instant satisfactory response to Kerensky's appeal increased the suspicion and distrust of every profession of idealism felt by those who looked upon the war as a capitalist-imperialist enterprise. Just as in Russia the soldiers said to Kerensky, "They do not make the statement you ask them to make, because they dare not openly reveal their real intentions or profess to share yours," so in Great Britain, in France, in Italy, and even here in the United States, the skeptics expressed similar sentiments. Lenin and Trotzky played upon the suspicions of the soldiers in Russia, and as similar suspicions gained ground here, especially among the millions of working people of Russian birth, the suspicions were played upon by pro-

OF BOLSHEVISM

German, Pacifist, and Bolshevik propaganda.

From the time of Kerensky's appeal to the abortive and fatuous negotiations for the Prinkipo Conference, and even afterward, the Allies made practically every mistake there was any opportunity for them to make, and failed to utilize opportunity after opportunity to give Russia real aid. No one, in all probability, seriously believes that either our government or our allies ever entertained any hope or desire to restore Czarism in Russia, but our conduct often laid us open to that suspicion. We stumbled along, hesitating, uncertain, vacillating, and contradictory in our ways. One day we seemed to encourage the Bolsheviks; next day we seemed to encourage their opponents. Well does the venerable Catherine Breshkovsky, a genuine and sincere lover of America, say: "Having watched the Allied policy in Russia, I may say that the policy has been so undefined and contradictory that I cannot find a single principle which would explain it. The Allied policy¹ is an enigma to us." It has been an enigma to every student of Russian affairs. Its one outstanding result has been to strengthen Bolshevism, not only in Russia, but throughout the world.

¹Catherine Breshkovsky, *Struggling Russia*, issue of March 29, 1919, "The Allies in Russia."

THE PSYCHOLOGY

XV

Finally, if we would understand why millions of people in all lands have turned away from old ideals, old loyalties, and old faiths, to Bolshevism, with something of the passion and frenzy characteristic of great Messianic movements, we must take into account the intense spiritual agony and hunger which the great war has brought into the lives of civilized men. The old gods are dead and men are everywhere expectantly waiting for the new gods to arise. The aftermath of the war is a spiritual cataclysm such as civilized mankind has never before known. The old religions and moralities are shattered and men are waiting and striving for new ones. It is a time suggestive of the birth of new religions. Man cannot live as yet without faith, without some sort of religion. The heart of the world today is strained with yearning for new and living faiths to replace the old faiths that are dead. Were some persuasive fanatic to arise proclaiming himself to be a new Messiah, and preaching a religion of action, the creation of a new society, he would find an eager, soul-hungry world already predisposed to believe.

It is trite to say that the recent war brought

OF BOLSHEVISM

about a revolution in the minds and hearts of millions of men and women in all lands. This is a commonplace of our daily speech, yet few possess the insight to perceive or the courage to contemplate the vastness of the revolution that has taken place. We are stunned, bewildered, and benumbed in our senses. We are as men who walk and act in hypnotic sleep. There is a striking analogy between the shell-shock suffered by many of the soldiers during the war, and the mental and moral state in which millions of people find themselves. Just as the victim of shell-shock may outwardly appear normal and uninjured, doing many things in the usual way, yet subject to subtle amnesias and other functional inhibitions, so countless thousands of people throughout the civilized world, outwardly normal, are really victims of what might be termed spiritual traumatic shock. There are subtle inhibitions of the moral judgment and motor energies and something very closely analogous to amnesia. Things which seemed, and were, of vital spiritual significance before the war are no longer remembered, except, perhaps, in the vague and dim way that incidents of childhood's experience dwell like faint shadows in the mem-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

ory in later life. Old moral and spiritual habits are abandoned, obliterated as by some violent injury. The spiritual anchorages have been lost and the souls of men are drifting.

The causes are very easy to perceive and to enumerate. They are, indeed, so obvious that they frequently are overlooked. Let us consider some of the salient facts: This was a war of peoples, not of armies merely. The armies themselves, raised by conscriptions in most cases, consisting of millions of men, were representative of whole populations as armies never were before. These men had been torn from their families, their friends, their homes, their customary occupations, by the coercive power of the State, and, against their will, in millions of instances, compelled to become active combatants in the most sanguinary of all wars. Men who have grown up in a civilization ordered by law instead of brute force, inured to the disciplines of law-abiding communities, trained to regard human life as sacred, to submit their wrongs to judicial tribunals for redress, have been massed in millions in a great contest of force. They have been trained to hunt and kill men, to use every means of dealing out death and destruction. Whether Prussian hegemony should be estab-

OF BOLSHEVISM

lished over Europe, or whether there should be a free confraternity of nations, was an issue to be established, not by reason or the principles of morality, but by weight of armaments and superiority of numbers. In a word, mankind went back to its primal instincts and its primal faith in force. The restraints of religion, of culture, of civil law, were torn off, like the thin veneer of polish stripped from the rough and inferior wood which it hid from sight.

These millions of men learned to regard death as trivial, to hold human life as of small importance. They saw men die by thousands; horrible and violent death came to friend and foe alike, but the appalling carnage did not stop the ghastly game. So indifferent to death did they become perforce that they could walk upon corpses, or make ramparts of them, and regard it as a commonplace thing. To kill masses of human beings like themselves became the daily task of armies, to be accomplished with as little concern as though they were killing pestiferous insects infesting an orchard. A few individuals in a company or a regiment might be inspired and sustained by the thought of serving some glorious ideal, but for the vast majority this moral passion

THE PSYCHOLOGY

did not, and could not, exist. The grim game of slaughter had been decided upon in the chancelleries and they were forced into it.

These soldiers have learned from the tragic experiences forced upon them to disregard individual distinctions. The refinements of individual culture, and even of character, have ceased to hold any vital significance for them. In the great fray only courage and fearlessness count in the last analysis. These qualities may be possessed by the drunkard, the thief, the illiterate lout, and be absent from the sober, honest, educated citizen. Bullets, shrapnel, shell-fragments, aerial bombs, flames, and drifting waves of poison gas are quite void of discrimination. They kill with equal ease and impartiality cook's son and duke's son, peasant and millionaire. The trench levels all to a primordial equality. In the muck and the mire of warfare, away from the arrangements of civilization, compelled to live in very primitive ways, men soon attain a common level of thought and of habit. They cease to be individuals and become a mass with a mass mind. This mass mind is generally lower in intelligence and culture, and less capable of fine discrimination, than the average individual mind in the mass. Rarely

OF BOLSHEVISM

indeed is it higher, and then only under the extraordinary influence of some dominant personality.

The necessities of modern military organization tend to increase this leveling process rather than to check it. There is the same need, and therefore the same incentive, to care for the peasant as for the philosopher. The sinner is as valuable as the saint. The values of normal civilized life disappear to a very large extent. The most illiterate boor must be protected against typhoid equally with the most cultured man in the ranks. Hence there is uniformity of clothing, equipment, food, medical supervision, and so on through the whole range of the things required for a simple but quite efficient sort of life. Thus the conditions of life in modern warfare develop a sort of communism, which a brilliant Russian, C. A. Kovalsky, has aptly termed "Trench Communism."

Parallel to the disregard of human life there develops an equal disregard of property and its rights. In war areas the rights of property are set aside and sacrificed to military objectives. Homes and possessions are taken for the use of troops. Buildings are destroyed by fire or by explosives whenever this

THE PSYCHOLOGY

gives a better range for artillery fire or lessens the danger of harm from the fire of the enemy. Armies indulge in pillage not only when they are in the country of the enemy, but almost equally in their own country. The passage of an army in war-time, even through its own country, among its own people, is often like the passage of great hosts of devouring locusts which leave the fields bare.

After being subject to such influences as these for months, and even for years, armies are suddenly demobilized. Millions of men are turned back into civil life with all its restraints and conventions. Is it to be wondered at that so many find themselves unable to resume normal civil life? Is there anything strange in the fact that such periods of readjustment and restoration are generally disturbed, and almost invariably characterized by a great increase of crime, especially of crimes against life and property? Quite apart from the crimes due to mental derangements due to the overstrain of war life, there is an appreciable increase in the crime rate which can be directly laid to the psychology of war.

Take men who have gone through such experiences—and they are legion—and consider how Bolshevism must appear to them: Its

OF BOLSHEVISM

methods are undemocratic; it does not depend upon the decision and freely expressed will of the majority, but upon the decision and daring of a few. Shocking as this may seem to the law-abiding citizen with his growing reliance upon democratic methods, to the soldier it suggests a very close parallel to military methods. War is decided upon by the few and their decision is imposed by force upon the many. Bolshevism is brutal; its leaders have not hesitated to kill many human beings to attain their ends. In this, too, it is very like war as these men have known it. The Bolsheviki confiscate property and violate property rights in trying to carry out their program. The same thing takes place in every great war.

Millions of men who have gone through this war have been made practically incapable of feeling moral indignation at the acts of the Bolsheviki or at Bolsehvism. If millions of lives may be sacrificed, whole provinces devastated, thousands of cities and villages ruined and laid in ruins and whole populations terrorized, in order that political ends determined upon by little conclaves of statesmen and diplomats may be attained, why be surprised or shocked when similar evils are

THE PSYCHOLOGY

wrought by men whose aim is so much greater, so much more ambitious? If such things are condoned when the object desired is the preservation of the existing social order, with its many inequalities and shortcomings, shall there be no excuse, no condonation, if they are done by men whose object is the creation of a new social order, free from poverty, from exploitation and oppression? This is the manner of reasoning common to a vast number of men who have had their whole mental outlook changed by their experiences in the great war just ended.

That a certain proportion of the men who have served in the various armies and had their lives so thoroughly revolutionized surrender to the specious propaganda of Bolshevism ought not to perplex or surprise us. Instead of marveling that there should be so many of them, we might very well marvel that there are not many more. Yet there is danger in an easy complacence. When the house is afire hysteria and complacence are equally dangerous, because they each make effective thought and action difficult. Serious students of the social problem have long known that a great war would bring an aftermath of revolutionary unrest fraught with

OF BOLSHEVISM

great possibilities of danger. Not for a brief period, but for many years to come, these possibilities of danger will remain and must be reckoned with by governments. Great is the responsibility of the statesman of today and tomorrow. Men who shared in the great adventure and fought to defeat autocracy and to "make the world safe for democracy" will never be content to tolerate autocracy and despotism in industry. Men who crossed the haunted seas, defying the lurking submarines; who fought side by side with men of many nations in the far-flung battle lines of Europe; whose eyes beheld the air above them transformed to a battlefield and who have bayoneted living men, will not shrink from the use of violence in order to secure what they believe to be justice for themselves and those they love. No sanctity of law or property rights will for long hold such men under the bondage of the industrial autocrat or the profiteer. Negro soldiers who fought side by side with white comrades against white foes, who bore their equal share of danger and sacrifice, will not be content to remain despised and subject to race discrimination and prejudice.

In the civilian populations of the belligerent

THE PSYCHOLOGY

nations the late war likewise developed a psychology favorable to Bolshevism and fraught with peril. In the most advanced countries men and women had come to look upon war as a terrible evil belonging to a less enlightened age. They rejoiced in their belief that, thanks to the internationalization of commerce, of science, of religion, and to the enormously increased cost and destructiveness of modern armaments, great wars had been impossible. As from a dream they awoke to the terrible reality of a world aflame. They saw the things upon which their faith was based swept away like seared leaves before a gale. Then, after a brief moment of consternation and despair, the people in each of these countries, acting under the mighty impulse of a common ideal, achieved a degree of solidarity, a homogeneity of vision and purpose, such as only the Utopians had ever dared forecast. Thus welded, they set themselves to the achievement of purposes for which no price seemed too high, no sacrifice too great.

In each of these nations the intellectual elite consecrated their genius to the creation of a propaganda idealizing the war, glorifying service in the national army as a high priv-

OF BOLSHEVISM

ilege and honor, proving that their side was one hundred per cent right and innocent of wrong-doing and the other side one hundred per cent wrong and guilty—all to the end that the national morale might be made invincible. If much that was blatant, crude, vulgar, and even vicious, appeared as patriotism, so too, on the other hand, did the noblest and best fruits of human effort. Something like a great, genuine religion of service appeared. Men and women put luxury aside and gloried in privation. Party strife was hushed and a “sacred union” of all for the common good was born. Men and women forsook idle enjoyments and worked as men and women can only work under the urge of a great ideal. In the voluntary organizations for war service which appeared in each country we glimpsed the almost infinite possibilities of human fellowship in labor and sacrifice. The proud and the humble, the rich and the poor, the famous and the obscure all came together, each serving according to his own capacity. And when the tidings of bereavement came there was no complaint. Men and women in the presence of the immeasurable sorrow of the world bore the burdens of individual grief with proud fortitude.

THE PSYCHOLOGY

Under this psychological influence conscription was made possible in countries like Great Britain and the United States, countries whose citizens have always regarded it with repugnance and resisted all efforts to fasten the system upon them as a regular institution. War entered almost every home in which youth dwelt. Armies sprang up out of the mines, the factories, the farms, and the schools. The great and complex organization of industry was quickly diverted from the service of peace to the service of war. Factories which had produced tools of husbandry, and even toys for selfish idle men and women, produced guns and shells to blast the way for the armies overseas. The greatest leaders of industry, who had been so contemptuous of government, placed their gifts of knowledge and skill at the disposal of the Government in order that the soldiers fighting at the front should lack nothing that the national resources made possible. The most cherished liberties were surrendered with quiet resignation because the military experts said that the sacrifice was necessary. To win freedom for democracy, to end the menace of autocracy, the most democratic nations laid their democracy aside and suffered new forms of bu-

OF BOLSHEVISM

reaucratic despotism to be imposed upon them. Individual liberty dwindled until it became little more than a memory.

Peace-loving peoples learned to hate whole nations and to gloat over the tidings of great masses of slaughtered foes. The civilian came to regard life as lightly as the soldier in the trenches. When the individual was touched directly by the loss of one dearly beloved, he found consolation in the thought that the sacrifice was for a great purpose. When the long lists of names of killed and wounded men filled the columns of the newspapers, when men and women in mourning attire, and broken and maimed men from the front filled the streets, that became the collective attitude: the sacrifice was justified by the great end to be attained. For the attainment of that end no sacrifice of human life even seemed to be too great.

It became the *idee fixe* of whole peoples that the world could never be the same again; that out of the travail and agony a different sort of a world must surely rise to justify the destruction and suffering. Only the consolation of that faith made it possible to bear the heavy burden of suffering and sorrow which the war imposed upon them. Just as the be-

THE PSYCHOLOGY

lief in an eternal life of perfect happiness to come has made it possible for millions of human beings to endure lives of poverty and suffering, so the conviction that the war must lead to a freer, juster, nobler state of society made it possible for whole peoples to live through the long years of otherwise unendurable agony. The human soul needs the strong support of faith. It was faith that made it possible for the war-weary Titan, mankind, to stagger on, with deaf ears and grief-dimmed eyes, passively struggling toward the goal, bearing the load well-nigh too heavy to be borne. A spirit of Apocalyptic expectancy became almost universal. Men felt that great changes were inevitable and imminent—changes commensurate in vastness and importance with the war and its incalculable cost in suffering. Millions of human beings were thus psychologically ready for the most revolutionary changes in society, and ready, too, to face calmly the possibility that these changes would involve a relentless use of force and the sacrifice of human life. Millions of lives had been destroyed to attain smaller ends, why, therefore, shrink from the sacrifice of hundreds or thousands to attain the Earthly Paradise for evermore, free

OF BOLSHEVISM

from war, from poverty, from economic oppression?

As in the case of the soldiers from the trenches, a greatly preponderant majority retained sufficient mental balance to enable them to withstand the insidious propaganda of Bolshevism. They found it easier to believe in progress through the orderly development of existing democratic instrumentalities than through a violent cataclysm. With the demobilization of the armies these men and women have demonstrated that healthy normality upon which democracy must always rely. But there remains a great mass of the less well-balanced to imperil the whole fabric of society. These are the romanticists, the hyper-emotionalists, the credulous, and those who have lost faith in all except the same brute force which crushed the military ambitions of Prussian autocracy by overpowering militarism. Surely, the obvious concern of sane statesmanship, and of intelligent citizenship, should be so to manage the problems arising from demobilization and readjustment as to strengthen the faith of the former and avoid imposing additional stress upon the latter. That is the spirit in which

THE PSYCHOLOGY

the situation confronting civilization should be faced.

It cannot fairly be claimed that either our own Government or that of any other nation has manifested very great wisdom or courage in meeting the challenge inherent in the new conditions. The world's statesmen have significantly failed to comprehend the utter inadequacy of old theories and methods to meet the new order of things. Thirty-five millions of men were under arms, it is estimated, when the Armistice was signed. The demobilization of these immense armies, and of the millions of civilian auxiliaries to them; the wholly changed mentality of the men, many of whom find in the homes they left environments no longer suitable; the friction inseparable from the process of turning industry and commerce back into the channels of peace —these are equivalent to bringing immense masses of highly inflammatory materials into the very heart of the social structure, needing only a touch from the torch of revolt to set the whole mass aflame.

Men and women whose minds have been prepared by their experience for the reception of Bolshevik teachings ought not to be subjected to unnecessary irritation. It is

OF BOLSHEVISM

foolish and dangerous to continue one day longer than is absolutely necessary the extraordinary limitations imposed during the war upon the freedom of the citizen to give full expression to his convictions and beliefs. It is foolish and dangerous to oppose the universally growing demand for democratic control of industry. It is foolish and dangerous to permit profiteering in the people's food, clothing, and shelter. All these things, and worse, have been taking place in practically every country, including our own, with the result that Bolshevism rages like a forest fire which threatens to become uncontrollable. And the statesmen and diplomats of the world charged with the great task of making peace, learning nothing from the past, blind to the perils of the present, have made of the negotiations for peace an irritant as dangerous as war itself. They have delayed the comfort and freedom from suspense for which the peoples of many nations yearned by their intrigues, their higgling and haggling, their reckless passion for power.

XVI

In order to combat Bolshevism and kindred forms of social unrest and revolt with success,

THE PSYCHOLOGY

it is necessary at the very outset to abandon all thought of relying upon repressive and punitive measures. If social revolt could be put down by brute force Czarism would never have been overthrown. Gallows, firing squad, underground dungeon, solitary prison cell, exile—these and every other form of repression and terrorism which unscrupulous despotism could devise were used by the government of Czar Nicholas II. in desperate but vain endeavor to crush out the spirit of revolt. As history plainly shows all who have eyes to see, repression utterly failed to accomplish the purposed end and served only to increase that which it was intended to destroy. Where Czarism failed in the use of its special and chosen weapons, no democratic nation can hope to succeed. It is a most distressing circumstance that upon every hand proposals are made to inaugurate a great campaign of repression to the end that Bolshevism may be destroyed. Those who give this counsel are more dangerous than the Bolsheviks themselves. The maddest of mad men is he who proposes to establish and protest Freedom by means of the instrumentalities of Tyranny.

History gives us counsel if we will but

OF BOLSHEVISM

harken, counsel in which the experience of mankind is summarized for our guidance. And this is the counsel: Bolshevism cannot be locked within prison walls. It cannot be burned at the stake. It cannot be strangled upon the gallows. It cannot be exiled. It cannot be beaten with clubs. No amount of repressive legislation can drive it out of the minds and hearts of men. All that physical force can accomplish is to drive the spirit of revolt into subterranean, secret conspiratorial channels. Once we place our reliance upon methods of force to rid ourselves of Bolshevism or other forms of social revolt we must abandon everything that distinguishes democratic from despotic government. We must maintain and use a vast secret police service, an immense army of spies; domiciliary search without warrant will of necessity become a regular police method; *agents provocateurs* will become a terrible menace. And when all these agencies of government by repression and police terrorism have been established it will be found that the spirit of social revolt flourishes naturally in the dark and secret channels of conspiracy, like those noisome fungi and bacteria which flourish

THE PSYCHOLOGY

best in dark and dank places where the cleansing sunlight never penetrates.

The first concern of a democratic nation in dealing with social discontent and revolt must be to keep the agitation in the open, where it can be seen by all and freely discussed. War is an exceptional, wholly abnormal, condition of life, and the ordinary principles and methods of democratic government are not applicable to it. At such times, propaganda may be the most dangerous method of attack used by the enemy, as the Italian debacle at Caporetto showed. But in times of peace the ways of democratic government are safer and more effective than any other. The most powerful weapon to use against a propaganda that is false is a propaganda that is true. The lie and the half-truth are best opposed by truth. Bolshevik ideas cannot be beaten out of men's heads and hearts, but they can be driven out by democratic ideas that are sound and true. Ten thousand citizens equipped with a thorough knowledge of the subject could, by a counter-propaganda, do more to check Bolshevism than ten times as many police agents. To doubt this is to doubt the validity of the democratic ideal.

Discussion is not enough, however. Merely

OF BOLSHEVISM

to make the nation into a vast forum or debating society will not rid us of Bolshevism. We must deal with the problem constructively, by means of a well considered, comprehensive program of reform. We must recognize that Bolshevism springs from a bitter sense of social injustice and can only be destroyed by removing that sense. Social justice, and the widely diffused consciousness of its reality, alone can put an end to the disease. The theory guiding the numerous official "investigations" of Bolshevism, that it is the product of the guile or fanaticism of "agitators," is at once very pathetic and very dangerous. The cause of Bolshevism lies, not in the guile or fanaticism of agitators, but in the harsh experience of multitudes of people whose spokesmen the agitators become. Quinet, that able historian and defender of the French Revolution, to whom we owe so much of our knowledge of such men as Robespierre and Marat, describes the significance of the latter in an eloquent passage which applies equally to Bolshevism today:

"It was a voice crying from the underworld, the piercing cry of a whole world of torment. It burst from the bosom of the past thousand years' slavery; it was the product of that past

THE PSYCHOLOGY

*—its horrible creature, its monster, its roar. Before being let loose on the world it was for centuries irritated, prepared for fury, as bulls are irritated in the torturous narrow pen before being let out, foaming with madness into the arena.”**

Our task is to uproot the wrongs inherited from the past, lest the hatred born of those wrongs engulf and destroy not the wrongs alone but all the rich heritage of good bequeathed to us by that same past. And we must begin by making government truly democratic and quickly responsive to the people's will freely expressed. The autocratic, bureaucratic, and despotic methods imposed upon us by the exigencies of war must be thrown off, and the sooner this is done the better will it be for all. There must be a more immediate and definite responsibility of government to the electorate. Some way must be found to make the heads of the actual government of the country, those charged with functions of vital importance, immediately answerable to the elected representatives of the people. The President's Cabinet ought to

**La Révolution*, chap. VIII.

OF BOLSHEVISM

become the Cabinet of Congress itself, its members being elected by Congress and controlled by it. At any rate every member of the Cabinet should be compelled to attend certain regular sessions of Congress and be subject to questioning and criticism concerning the administration of the several departments.

Such an arrangement would act as a safety valve. It would make it possible for abuses to be quickly brought to light and for remedies to be quickly applied. If the Postmaster-General, for example, had been compelled to attend certain regular sittings of the House of Representatives and the Senate in order that he might be questioned concerning the affairs of his very important department, it is practically certain that either there would have been a very much more satisfactory administration of the postal system or a new Postmaster-General. Nearly forty years have elapsed since a Congressional Committee which included James G. Blaine, John J. Ingalls, and William B. Allison unanimously reported a bill embodying this reform, but we are still without the safety valve.

To provide some method whereby grievances and complaints may be quickly brought to the light of day is necessary and wise, but

THE PSYCHOLOGY

it is necessary to go much deeper than that. We must eliminate the causes of unrest. The wages system as we know it is doomed: it has become obsolete. There can never be freedom from industrial revolt so long as the wages of the workers are virtually monopoly prices, arbitrarily fixed, either by the monopoly of labor-power by the unions or the monopoly of jobs by the employers. Wages constitute the basis of existence for millions of families. The whole physical and moral well-being of society is at stake. A difference in the wage-rate reflects itself in a difference in the death rate and in the crime rate. The black tide of prostitution rises with every material decline in the wage-rate, as thousands of investigations have shown. To permit a matter so vital as the fixing of wages to be dependent upon accidental circumstances, such as the fluctuations of supply and demand, or upon the monopoly power possessed by this or the other group, is unscientific and provocative of dangerous unrest.

Wages can be and should be definitely related to the standard of living, to the sum of available consumption goods. Every human being has a right to an abundance of good food and good clothing, to be well and de-

OF BOLSHEVISM

cently housed, to be well-educated and to possess leisure for recreation and enjoyment. These are the minimum necessities of the normal human being, and failure to secure them is evidence of the failure of the individual or of society. Because it is not possible for all human beings to attain them, even by honest labor, it follows that we have to do with failure on the part of society. No wage, whatever its amount in dollars and cents may be, is a just or fair wage which does not make it possible for the wage-earner to obtain these minimum necessities of a decent human existence for himself and for his wife and children. What we need, then, is a standard of wages bearing a definite relation to the cost of the things which go to make up the economic basis of a decent and wholesome life. Wages should be measured by purchasing power. It is time to end the mockery of "high wages" with low purchasing power, expecting the workers to be satisfied with money increases which possess power only to purchase a decreased amount of commodities. Wages ought to be measured by commodity prices, the norm being the "index figure" of the combined prices of a representative number of staple and necessary commodities. Then

THE PSYCHOLOGY

wages would advance as prices advanced, falling again if prices fell.

The old term "a fair wage," so much used by economists and social reformers, was never very clearly defined. It is now coming to have a very definite meaning. The only fair wage is that wage which enables the worker to obtain for himself and his family, first, all the requisites of a sound, healthy, physical life. These include, abundant, wholesome food, good clothing, and good housing. Secondly, it must enable the worker to obtain for himself and for his family every educational and cultural advantage essential to high mental and moral development. There must be equality of opportunity for every child.

It is the task of the State to see that there is employment for every worker at work that is in itself worthy and not degrading, under conditions which are not needlessly exhausting or injurious to health, for recompense which will make it possible for the workers and their families to attain physical, mental, and moral efficiency. Any State which fails in the discharge of this duty will be menaced, sooner or later, by an uprising of the victims of its neglect and failure. Housing is too vitally connected with physical and moral

OF BOLSHEVISM

health to justify leaving it to private enterprise. The alarming shortage of dwellings which are at once fit for habitation and to be had at rentals which wage-earners can pay is a very grave problem. Over-crowding is an increasing evil, and there is abundant evidence that over-crowding inevitably leads to increased disease, vice, and crime. Perhaps no other single evil is so prolific a breeder of social despair. It is difficult to see how anything less than a comprehensive plan financed by the Federal Government and carried out by it in co-operation with the municipalities can meet the housing problem as it exists today.

A substantial reduction of the hours of labor is necessary in a majority of industrial occupations. At the same time, there must be a very great increase in production. It is impossible to see how there can be any solution of this two-fold problem unless and until the whole management of industry is democratized and brought under the direct control of those most vitally concerned, the producers and the consumers. The organization and management of industry by capitalists, motived solely or mainly by their own selfish interests, modified somewhat by the power of